DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 129

6 July 1982

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Commentary on Geneva Strategic Arms Negotiations	AA 1
Rebuttal on Soviet Motive [Dmitriyev]	AA 1
USSR Not 'Forced' [Ponomarev]	AA 1
PRAVDA on 'Equality' [3 Jul]	AA 2
Vishnevskiy in PRAVDA [4 Jul]	AA 2
U.S., USSR Approaches [Bovin]	AA 3
General Kozlov Interview [Rome L'UNITA 29 Jun]	AA 4
U.S., Soviet Disarmament Stances Contrasted	AA 6
Kuznetsov in PRAVDA [24 Jun]	AA 6
Teplov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA [24 Jun]	AA 8
Allegations of SS-20 Deployment Refuted	AA 10
FRG: U.S. Data Reliable [DPA]	AA 10
Refutation of FRG Claim [Ablamov]	AA 10
Viktor Levin Commentary	AA 11
Materials on U.S. Military Space Program	AA 12
Military Control Timetable	AA 12
Columbia's Military Tests	AA 12
Reagan Speech at Edwards AFB [Ivanov]	AA 12
Further on Reagan Speech [Sobolev, Doronin]	AA 13
U.S. Plans [Pokrovskiy in PRAVDA 22 Jun]	AA 13
Arms Race Impetus [Linnik in PRAVDA 29 Jun]	AA 14
Senator Cranston Criticizes Reagan Arms Policies [PRAVDA 24 Jun]	AA 15

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA, EEC Trade, Economic Cooperation Urged	BB 1
Warsaw Pact Ideological Workers Meet in Sofia	BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'Studio 9' Program Examines World Events [Zorin, Zamyatin]	CC 1
Soviet Peace Initiative	CC 1
Reaction to Haig Resignation	CC 3
Mideast Situation	CC 5
Geneva Arms Talks Viewed	CC 8
U.S. Stance 'Not Acceptable'	CC 8
Falklands Dispute Reviewed	CC 9
Growing Antiwar Movement	CC 10
'International Observers Roundtable' for 4 July [Demchenko, Lomeyko, Ariyevich]	CC 10
Arms Stance Outlined	CC 11
Strained U.S.-NATO Relations	CC 11
U.S. Sanctions on Gas Pipeline	CC 12
Events in Lebanon	CC 14
Reaction in the Arab World	CC 15
Haig Departure Viewed	CC 16
Luns Urges Militarily Capable Merchant Fleets [Romanov in IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]	CC 17
Conference on Antarctica Opens in Leningrad	CC 18
'Cardiac Experts' Visit Uzbek Surgery Institute	CC 18

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Brezhnev Sends Fourth of July Cable to Reagan A 1
Reagan Policy Called 'Doctrine of Interference' A 1
Zhukov in PRAVDA [25 Jun] A 1
Comparison of Bolshakov Article A 4
[PRAVDA 28 Jun]
Speculation on Haig Resignation Examined A 4
Return to Obstruction [Zorin] A 4
Foreign Policy Crisis [Alekseyev] A 5
Reagan Asks Pope To Act on Poland, Antiwar Clergy A 6
[PRAVDA 19 Jun]

CHINA

Kichigin on U.S.-PRC Espionage Cooperation B 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]
PRAVDA Reports Expulsion of Chinese From MPR B 3
[23 Jun]
Barakhta on Richard Allen's Visit to Taiwan B 3
[PRAVDA 3 Jul]

NORTHEAST ASIA

IZVESTIYA Hits Suzuki Claims to Kuril Islands C 1
[Krotov, 25 Jun]
IZVESTIYA Criticizes U.S. Policy in S. Korea C 2
[Agafonov, 25 Jun]

SOUTH ASIA

Mauritius Demands Return of Diego Garcia D 1
[Shirokov in PRAVDA 26 Jun]
Ustinov Receives Indian Defense Official D 1
India's Rao Cited on Relations With USSR D 1
U.S. Encouraging Indian Separatist Movement D 2
Commentary on Simla Agreement Anniversary [Lagrov] D 3
U.S. Aid Finances Continuing 'War' Against DRA D 4
[Akhmedzyanov in IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Imelda Marcos Arrives in Moscow 5 July E 1
Guest of Supreme Soviet Presidium E 1
Meeting With Kuznetsov E 1
New Coalition Government of Kampuchea Viewed E 1
Interview With SRV's Thach [Romanov in IZVESTIYA 29 Jun] E 1
"World Today" Report [Kaverznev] E 2
ASEAN Concern [Zhukova] E 3
Sihanouk Derided E 4
Firyubin Meets SRV Vice Foreign Minister, Envoy E 4
Indonesian Minister on U.S.-Chinese Ties E 4
[PRAVDA 24 Jun]

WESTERN EUROPE

Joint Soviet-French Space Mission Completed G 1
Successful Soyuz Landing G 1
Crew Awarded Decorations G 1

Mitterrand Sends Greetings G 1
Space Crew Interviewed G 2
Reaction to Pipeline Ban, Prospect of Trade War G 3
Zamyatin Commentary G 3
Shishlin Commentary G 3
Kalyagin on European Opposition G 4
Drobkov on Trade War [PRAVDA 17 Jun] G 4
Schmidt Criticism Cited [PRAVDA 26 Jun] G 5
Brezhnev, Pertini Exchange Telegrams of Greetings G 6

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Gromyko Discusses Lebanon With Arab Ministers H 1
PRAVDA Devotes Leading Article to Lebanese Crisis [5 Jul] H 1
Israel Bent on Elimination of Palestinians [Zamyatin] H 2
Israeli Use of U.S. Weapons in Lebanon Viewed H 3
Olin Commentary H 3
Vishnevskiy Article [PRAVDA 4 Jul] H 3
TASS Report H 4
Israeli, U.S. Positions on Lebanon Analyzed H 4

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

U.S.-S. Africa Accord on Namibia Draws Comment J 1
TASS Analyst Kulik J 1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA J 1
Minister Heads Ugandan Delegation on USSR Visit [IZVESTIYA 25 Jun] J 2
Television Agreement Signed With Zimbabwe J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Latin Americans Boycott U.S. Naval Exercises K 1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on U.S. Subversion in Nicaragua [17 Jun] K 1
PRAVDA on Argentine Political Reorganization [24 Jun] K 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agricultural Developments for 2-5 Jul Reported T 1
Editorial Views Importance of Grain Production [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun] T 2
Agriculture Ministry Views Harvest Preparations [PRAVDA 24 Jun] T 4
Fodder Harvest Status, Problems Examined T 5
RSFSR Progress [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Jun] T 5
Organization Problems [Luzgan in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 23 Jun] T 6
CSA Reports Haymaking Productivity Increases T 7

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Salyut-7 Station Continues Research Mission U 1
Earth Tremor Registered in Dushanbe on 2 July U 1

COMMENTARY ON GENEVA STRATEGIC ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

Rebuttal on Soviet Motive

LD021952 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Observer Igor Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] At a meeting with editors and broadcasters from western states in Los Angeles on Thursday President Reagan said in part that the enormous military buildup he was embarked upon is what has brought the Soviet Union to the negotiation table as quickly as they came, and it is this that we think will keep them there. We bring you a comment by our observer, Igor Dmitriyev:

The Soviet Union was quick to come to the negotiation table because it is prepared for talks and willing to resume them. Calling limitation in regard to strategic arms a paramount problem, Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev told the 26th Communist Party Congress in Moscow in February 1981: We are prepared to continue the relevant negotiations with the United States without delay, preserving all the positive elements that have so far been achieved in this area.

The Reagan administration has dragged their feet on this issue for a number of reasons. One of them was quite a bit of haggling between Pentagon and State Department officials over what and how to discuss. The Pentagon wanted to discuss throwweight; unaffected by such a revolutionary approach, State Department officials were in favor of discussing numerical ceilings. Meanwhile the President himself was busy scaring his own people and West Europeans stiff with various war doctrines, from a limited nuclear war in Europe to a global and protracted conflict, both nuclear and conventional. All this helps explain why it took the Reagan administration some 18 months to respond to the Soviet appeals to resume the talks.

Despite an about-face from doomsday scenarios of nuclear war to sweet overtures about the antiwar and freeze movements, the administration is making a big mistake. It is indeed a big mistake to believe that nuclear blackmail works with the Soviet Union or will be helpful in the future. The present administration could have consulted former high-ranking officials on this matter; and if they do not want to ask former presidents or whoever, they will find this out themselves.

To say that it is the enormous American military buildup that keeps the Russians at the negotiation table is a matter of taste or a complete lack thereof. But to build a foreign policy on this assumption is a dangerous delusion. There is no such thing as one security being better than another, and there is no such thing as trying to intimidate or frighten somebody into disarmament. The more American officials say that nuclear blackmail is an incentive for the Soviets to negotiate, the more suspicious one can get as to whether Washington is really sincere about the whole thing.

To set the record straight: It is not Washington's military buildup but Moscow's patience and restraint and the growing influence of the freeze movement in the United States and antiwar movements in Western Europe that has made it possible to resume the long awaited talks in Geneva. It's peace champions who can make this world a safer place, not hawks.

USSR Not Forced

LD021632 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1244 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jul (TASS) -- TASS observer Leonid Ponomarev writes:

In Los Angeles yesterday President Reagan, addressing the editors of newspapers and radio and television commentators of the U.S. West Coast, claimed that the United States, more particularly his administration, had 'forced' the Soviet Union to negotiate in Geneva on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

As is known, these Soviet-American negotiations opened on 29 June after almost 18 months of foot-dragging and artificial delays of various kinds on the part of the U.S. administration. The American newspaper NEWSDAY noted in that regard that it was Reagan and his advisers who for a long time virtually ruled out all possibility of negotiations with the USSR in this key area for mankind.

It is no secret that it was the United States that refused to ratify the prepared and signed SALT-II treaty, on the drafting of which 7 years of painstaking work was spent, while the present administration has shelved the treaty.

The Soviet Union has constantly called for the renewal of talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons on a basis of equality and equal security. And it was not Moscow but Washington which resisted for many months and was only forced to agree to talks under pressure from the international public, including the American public.

Another factor which attracts attention is that Washington continues to stick to the idea that the Soviet Union can have something imposed upon it against its will and wishes. This is quite a dangerous self-delusion with regard to the USSR. The Soviet Union did not ask Washington for its agreement to the talks and it is high time that an obvious truth -- that both the Soviet side and the United States are interested in the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms to the same degree -- is accepted. The talks in Geneva were started in the interests of both sides. Nevertheless, one gets the impression that ruling circles in the United States are now trying to use the Geneva talks as a screen to conceal the arms race and to gain superiority over the USSR. To put it plainly, they won't get anywhere this way.

PRAVDA on 'Equality'

LD032342 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] The Soviet national daily PRAVDA says the Soviet-American talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms which have just begun in Geneva can succeed only provided the principle of equality and equal security of the parties is observed. The paper recalls that these talks were proposed by the Soviet Union almost 18 months ago. It is only now that the United States has at last come to the negotiating table.

But its negotiating position, based on President Reagan's speech on 9 May, is aimed at securing a military superiority. The United States has proposed cuts in those types of arms in which the Soviet Union has a preponderance, but glosses over the types of arms in which America has a considerable advantage. A fair agreement, PRAVDA says, can be drafted only of the legitimate security interests of both sides are considered.

Vishnevskiy in PRAVDA

LD040926 Moscow TASS in English 0838 GMT 4 Jul 82

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS -- Commenting on the Soviet-American negotiations on limitation and reduction of strategic armaments, which opened in Geneva on Tuesday, Sergey Vishnevskiy writes in an international review in PRAVDA today: "It can be stated with certainty that these negotiations would not have taken place, had it not been for the USSR which exerted persistent purposeful efforts aimed at restraining such armaments."

"The Soviet Union approaches the negotiations with the sincere intention to work for elaboration of such a decision that would promote consolidation of international stability, the interests of peace. The Soviet Union's decision to undertake the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons became a profound stimulus for the Geneva negotiations.

The Soviet Union put forward clear-cut guidelines, indicating ways towards attaining an accord. To ensure successful progress and outcome of the negotiations it is required that they should really pursue the aim of limitation and reduction of strategic armaments. It is necessary that the sides should conduct the negotiations with due account for the legitimate interests of each other's security and in strict accordance with the principle of equality and undiminished security. It is necessary to preserve everything positive which has been earlier attained. This also refers to the SALT-2 treaty," the commentator stresses.

Exclusively significant is the USSR's call to reliably close all channels for continuation of the strategic arms race in any form, to ban or restrict to the maximum by agreed upon parameters development of new types of such weapons, PRAVDA stresses in its review. The success of the negotiations would be promoted by adoption of the Soviet proposal which says that as soon as negotiations open strategic weapons should be frozen quantitatively and its modernization be limited to the utmost. It is also necessary that both powers should not undertake such steps that would lead to disrupting the strategic situation.

On the eve of the negotiations official Washington somewhat changed the tonality of public declarations, PRAVDA writes. But in that there is no hint to some departure from the proposals, made public on May 9, which put the Soviet side in an unequal position. Is it accidental that while talking of "equality" the Washington leaders did not utter a single word about equal security of the sides? And meanwhile, the basic principle, without the firm observance of which it is impossible to attain a mutually acceptable accord, has long been formulated in clear and precise terms (and the American side agreed with that): equality and undiminished security. An equitable agreement can be elaborated only without disrupting the existing military equilibrium between the USSR and the United States, with strictly taking into account the legitimate interests of security of either of the sides.

U.S., USSR Approaches

LD041650 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 4 Jul 82

[Commentary by Aleksandr Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; from the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Good day, comrades. The Americans are generally a cheerful people and put on a cheerful countenance in the face of bad luck. But it's becoming harder and harder as the bad luck persists. Haig's unexpected resignation dramatically brought to light, or rather emphasized, the fundamental weaknesses in American foreign policy. Let's look for example, at the 1 and a half years of the new administration. Relations have deteriorated with the Soviet Union, Western Europe, Japan, China and Latin America. Americans have also got into hot water in the Near East. Perhaps the only positive factor, if it can be so considered, is constituted by the improved relations with the Republic of South Africa. This is dubious asset, but perhaps it is comforting after all.

Articles written by Americans about American foreign policy are studded with words such as "a muddle," a "mess," "zig-zags," and "inconsistency." Take, for example, an article by Anthony Lewis in the New York TIMES. "The Reagan administration," he writes, "is the most incompetent, pathetic American Government of this century." Well, I would add that it is also the most hypocritical government, as only a few months ago the White House issued curses directed at the antiwar movement, and now the President is speaking as if he himself is about to march at the head of the antiwar demonstrations.

Sermons are now issued almost daily from the White House on peace, disarmament and talks. Well, incessant hypocrisy must also be difficult and get on one's nerves, and then we see a hard and aggressive tone breaking through. It was like this when the President spoke in the British House of Parliament. It was like this when he spoke at the United Nations. There he was speaking as a citizen of the world, a role which is even greater than that of being a citizen of one's own country.

But a Philadelphia newspaper interviewed Edward Rowny, head of the American delegation to the talks on strategic arms. Listen to this curious excerpt: "General Rowny," the journalist asks, "you said earlier that the political climate in U.S.-Soviet relations is of great importance to the success of the talks. I am troubled by the fact that on the eve of the talks President Reagan tried in every way possible in his UN speech to hammer out an extremely harsh anti-Soviet position. This could hardly promote an improvement in the climate. How do you explain this?" And here is what the general replied: "I do not think that President Reagan has changed his attitude. I did not notice any change in his position. He did not intend to soften his statements simply to help some talks. We want the atmosphere to be better. Everything depends on the Russians."

This "everything depends on the Russians" is a constant theme of American propaganda. Well, of course, in order to reach an agreement the participants must meet each other halfway. So, to create a favorable foundation for talks, to help move this business forward, we proposed to the Americans that neither side produce new types of weapons. And we heard "no." We proposed to the Americans that we should freeze the present level, and again we heard "no." Finally, we proposed that we should reach an agreement to the effect that neither the Soviet Union nor America should be the first to use nuclear weapons. And again they said "no." Although here the Americans put it this way: Even if we were to use nuclear weapons, it would be exclusively for defensive purposes. This was stated in such a way as to make it sound reasonably convincing and logical, but there is a hitch, comrades.

Let's put it this way: What were the Americans doing in Vietnam? Were they attacking or defending themselves? It goes without saying that in the view of Reagan and the present administration, they were, of course, defending themselves. Or, let's ask what Israel is doing in Lebanon? And again they will say that, of course, it is defending itself. Well, with such a concept of defense — when 100 percent aggression is called defense — these American stipulations look quite ambiguous and hypocritical.

Generally speaking, it is difficult, of course, to have dealings with the Americans at present, regardless of whether it is with or without Haig. They dodge about, say one thing and do another. They have a lot of ambition and much less understanding of the problems and complications of the situation. But anyway, there's no way out. We can't choose our partners. We'll have to hold talks with them. We'll have to do the best we can somehow to improve our relations. Perhaps life itself will teach them with time. There is this hope, but unfortunately it is, frankly speaking, a fairly weak one. And so that's how things are at the moment.

General Kozlov Interview

PM0021529 Rome L'UNITA in Italian 29 Jun 82 p 17

[Giulietto Chiesa dispatch: "Moscow's Approach? General Kozlov Tells Us"]

[Text] Moscow — It was 18 May and Leonid Brezhnev, addressing the Komsomol congress, had expressed appreciation of the "first step in the right direction" taken by President Reagan with his Eureka speech ratifying Washington's acceptance of the resumption of talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons.

Next came the bilateral U.S.-USSR announcement setting 29 June as the start for the second set of negotiations in Geneva. (As is known, the first set of talks concerns the limitation of medium-range nuclear weapons known as "Euromissiles.") And on 4 June PRAVDA carried a lengthy unsigned article which in effect constituted the platform which the Kremlin would bring to the first round of talks, starting today. Obviously, not a single dot has been changed in the Soviet stance since then.

If there is anything to be assessed, it is only the psychological climate, the appraisal of the interlocutor-cum-antagonist made in the Soviet capital. There has indeed been no lack of innovations in this short space of time: The very latest of them, and a really spectacular one, is the sudden and unexpected "political departure" of U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig. Cautious Soviet commentators are not concealing, however, some anxiety that Haig's departure could imply a deterioration in direct relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. This was confirmed to us yesterday by Maj Gen Svyatoslav Nikolayevich Kozlov at the headquarters of APN, of which he is a military commentator. "My impression," he said, "is that the forces setting their sights on a certain exacerbation of relations have become even stronger."

Does that mean that there will be repercussions on the course of the Geneva talks too? Kozlov believes that the strategic axis of the U.S. posture will not be affected at all. But Haig's resignation was not the only innovation: In the interim there has also been the conclusion of the British-Argentine war and, immediately after, the Israeli aggression against Lebanon. Both are subjects of harsh polemics between the United States and the Soviet Union, with the United States committed to supporting the victor's military action in both cases. Is this not a sufficient cause to make the political climate of the talks deteriorate? General Kozlov hurriedly denied it.

"It is not our policy to resort to 'linkages,'" he said. "We did not do so even during the Vietnam war, while the SALT negotiations were going on. We could do so now, by asking the United States to abandon their Middle East policy, but we have always rejected this criterion because we know that along this path no results are achieved either in the field of bilateral relations or in the field of strategic arms limitation." For that matter, General Kozlov did not omit to acknowledge that Reagan too has taken a not insignificant step back with regard to "linkage": "Otherwise," he said, "we certainly would not have reached Geneva."

Nevertheless, there is still great mistrust. As was apparent from PRAVDA 4 June article already mentioned (and as Svyatoslav Kozlov confirmed) Moscow considers Washington's present willingness to conduct a dialogue primarily guided by ulterior motives and insincere; but nevertheless it still describes the "strategic" beginning in Geneva as if it is capable of leading to a positive outcome.

Is this a hope or a tactical move? It is difficult to say. What is certain is the great distance between the interlocutors' starting positions and the existence of a single shared opinion — that it will take years of work before the end of the road is reached, that is, before some result, albeit minimal, is achieved. Maj Gen Kozlov said this yesterday in almost the same words as U.S. Ambassador Hartman used in an interview granted to Italian radio and television correspondent Antonio Natoli on Saturday.

Moscow puts forward conditions that it defines as "inalienable," stating that it hopes that the platform announced by Reagan is only a "feeler" that can be set aside to make way, as Kozlov put it, for "a stance founded on more reasonable bases." These conditions are quickly listed: first and foremost, "to examine in their entirety all components of the strategic potential" and also "to take account of the different structures" discussed by a large proportion of the aforementioned PRAVDA commentary which, among other things, accused the U.S. President of "a complete absence of objectivity and lack of common sense of moderation" in his expectation to "unilaterally disarm the Soviet Union." Second, Moscow insists on its demand to halt the development of new kinds of strategic weapons and proposes a "quantitative freeze" from the start of the talks. Third, it again puts forward the demand that the future agreements "embrace all the positive results already achieved during previous negotiations."

Reagan proposes a clever version of the "gradual approach." Moscow replies that to expect an agreement on a reduction of land-based ICBM's in the first instance would create a definite imbalance to the detriment of the Soviet side.

The reason for this can be seen from the fact — not questioned even by Reagan — that about 70 percent of Soviet nuclear warheads are installed on land-based missiles, whereas the figure on the U.S. side is about 20 percent of the total (the rest being installed on aircraft and nuclear submarines). The overall balance has been approximately observed (as stated in SALT II) but the different structure of the armaments makes the reduction criterion more complex. Of course it will take a long time. It is only to be hoped that meanwhile the situation does not become too complicated, both technically and politically, to be resolved.

U.S., SOVIET DISARMAMENT STANCES CONTRASTED

Kuznetsov in PRAVDA

PM051439 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 82 p 4

[Article by V. Kuznetsov: "For a Europe Without Nuclear Weapons"]

[Text] In the present complex international situation resolute actions are needed on the part of states and peoples in the interests of preventing nuclear war and radically easing military tension. Our country, true to its policy of peace, has come out with specific new initiatives aimed at eliminating the nuclear threat. The act of exceptional importance was announced in Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's message to the second special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament. The message declared that the Soviet Union has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

A whole series of measures of a material nature has also to be taken in order to strengthen strategic stability. These are covered in the USSR memorandum submitted to the second special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament. Apart from the other measures contained in it, great importance is attached to the solution of the problem of limiting and reducing nuclear arms in Europe. "Despite all the difficulties that have surfaced at the Soviet-American talks on this issue in Geneva," the memorandum says, "the Soviet Union is still motivated by the need to achieve progress and a mutually acceptable accord at them and is doing all it can to that end."

The international public knows how much good will and constructive endeavor the Soviet Union is putting into the accomplishment of the task of freeing Europe and the whole world from the threat of nuclear war. As is known, back in December 1979 the NATO countries, under pressure from Washington, took the decision on deploying around 600 medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe. As a counterbalance to this decision the Soviet Union continued to put forward proposals aimed at delivering the continent from the threat, posed by NATO's policy, of becoming a mountain of radioactive dust.

The USSR has stated more than once its readiness to reach agreement on the total renunciation by both sides — East and West — of all types of medium-range weapons trained on targets in Europe. The Soviet Union stated that it can go even further than that and reach agreement on completely ridding Europe of medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. But, if the West is not prepared for such a radical solution, our country has proposed agreement on a major — more than two-thirds — stage-by-stage reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons by both sides while maintaining the balance, in terms of NATO and Soviet devices subject to limitation, at all stages of reduction.

"We advocated the total liquidation of all medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe; the West objected, saying that this was going too far. We proposed that these weapons be reduced by more than two-thirds; we were told that was not enough. Fine; so let's find mutually acceptable numbers — we are ready for even bigger reduction — on a reciprocal basis, of course," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said at the Komsomol congress in May.

In order to facilitate progress at the Geneva talks, the USSR unilaterally halted the deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of its territory. Moreover, having announced the decision to cut back its arsenal of medium-range missiles, our country has already started reducing a considerable number of medium-range missiles, as has been officially announced.

However, far from following the Soviet Union's example, the West is sparing no effort to discredit it and lessen its impact on public opinion. What, declared the experts at twisting the facts, of the fact that the USSR is halting the deployment of missiles in the European part of its territory? It is a cunning maneuver, they say; the missiles will [merely] be withdrawn beyond the Urals, whence they can hit the West European countries. Imperialist propaganda was about to embark on the theme of an "unlimited arms race beyond the Urals." But the Soviet Union deprived the political speculators of their "argument" when it stated quite definitely: No further medium-range missiles will be deployed in areas where the FRG and other West European countries would be within their range. Another propaganda concoction assiduously prepared by the falsifiers, whereby the USSR, although it has announced a freeze on missiles deployment, is by no means halting preparations for their deployment but is continuing to construct launch facilities for them, has also been wrecked. The response to this fabrication was an authoritative explanation -- the unilateral freeze implies an end to all preparations for missile deployment, including the construction of launch pads.

Thus, people of good will all over the world cannot fail to see that the realistic and constructive position of the USSR, suffused with good will and a readiness to reach a mutually acceptable accord, is backed up by practical steps, including the adoption of unilateral measures. What is the West's response to this and what is its attitude toward the Geneva talks?

During his recent visit to West Europe U.S. President R. Reagan reiterated his so-called "zero option." It is worth remembering that its basic point is that the Soviet Union should unilaterally liquidate all its medium-range missiles, not only those in the European part of the USSR but those deployed in eastern parts of the country which have nothing to do with the problem of nuclear arms in Europe.

Meanwhile, addressing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, P. Nitze, had of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, declared that the Washington administration is approaching the dialogue with the USSR "seriously and sagely" and is also "optimistic" about their outcome. "We are moving forward vigorously and methodically," he insisted.

You realize the value of these statements when you read the U.S. press. Despite the confidential nature of the talks, it is giving an impression of being very well-informed about the "chess game" which Washington's representatives would like to play in Geneva. Having completed a leisurely opening gambit, they have switched to protracted positional play, obviously hoping their opponent will run out of time. "The White House now believes," TIME magazine writes, "that the Russians will give in as soon as they reach the conclusion that the deployment of U.S. missiles is about to begin." Need one dwell on the fact that these hopes are totally unsubstantiated.

The Soviet proposals create a solid basis for achieving positive results at the Geneva talks. But the NATO leaders clearly see them only as a barrier to the implementation of plans to turn the Western part of the continent into a launchsite for the Pentagon's nuclear missiles. Therefore the most important task facing the European peoples at the moment is that of stemming the growth of nuclear capabilities.

The situation is made worse by the White House's intention to intensify the arms race in other areas so as to "compensate" for possible limitations on medium-range nuclear weapons.

The point is that the cruise and Pershing II missiles earmarked for deployment in West Europe are ground-based weapons. As for the sea-based cruise missiles -- that is, those on submarines and surface ships -- formally they are not included in the contingent of medium-range weapons which, under the NATO decision, are destined for deployment in West Europe. Reagan's "zero option" reserves for the United States the right to deploy hundreds of cruise missiles on submarines and surface ships off the coast of Europe. New York TIMES military observer D. Middleton has anlayzed the various aspects of the ground and sea basing of these types of nuclear weapons and has good reason for believing that the "U.S. program for the construction and deployment of cruise missiles may become one of the biggest obstacles to the achievement of results at the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe."

It should be particularly emphasized that the negative factors inhibiting the process of nuclear weapons limitation in Europe are countered by substantial positive factors. These are, first and foremost, the concrete peace-loving actions and constructive initiatives of the USSR and the other socialist countries. Their policy is having a marked influence on the international situation, acquiring growing support among the fighters for peace, international security and a nuclear-free Europe. On both sides of the Atlantic more and more people are realizing the validity and justness of the Soviet position and the USSR's proposals aimed at maintaining the approximate balance of forces in Europe while reducing them as far as possible. Many prominent figures in the NATO countries, including Danish Prime Minister A. Jorgensen and Greek Prime Minister A. Papandreou, have welcomed the Soviet initiatives, particularly the moratorium proposal. The Danish prime minister believes that this proposal should be an element in the negotiating process.

"Many people in Europe now believe," the Los Angeles TIMES admits, "that the main threat to peace comes not from the Soviet Union but from the United States." The public sees Washington's "zero option" as a hurdle on the path to agreement in Geneva. West Germany's FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU notes: "No one can seriously see the Soviet side accepting this option. To the USSR, Reagan's proposal is immediately hypocritical because it demands that the USSR liquidate its most effective weapons, whereas the Americans, French and British do not have to say goodbye to a single nuclear bomb...." And the New York TIMES warns the White House: "If the United States does not come closer to a position which can be seriously discussed, then once again we are bound to sense the anxiety of the Europeans."

The anxiety of broad strata of the population in the countries of West Europe and in the United States itself, anxiety for the fate of peace and security, is forcing the White House to maneuver. But propagandist ruses unsupported by real actions cannot stem the rising tide of protests against Washington's course toward intensifying the arms race. The participants of the antiwar and antinuclear movement, which is becoming wider and wider, are demanding that Washington heed the will of the peoples and reciprocate the USSR's willingness to reach a mutually acceptable accord on a question of vital importance for the destiny of Europe and the whole world.

And the second special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament must speak out on this problem.

Teplov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA

PM0021457 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 82 p 3

[V. Teplov article: "Key Problem of Our Time"]

[Excerpt] The Soviet Union's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons was a manifestation of true concern for peace and the peoples' security. It is not easy to take unilateral decisions like that to the sound of military fanfares blaring out from those quarters where they are seeking to replace peaceful coexistence among states by military confrontation. Political courage and perspicacity are needed for this.

The USSR took this step under conditions where the nuclear powers within the NATO bloc, the United States included, are making no secret of the fact that their military doctrine not only does not rule out the possibility of the first use of nuclear weapons but is effectively based on that dangerous premise. Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's message [to the UN General Assembly special session, announcing this pledge] explains that the USSR took its decision on the basis of the incontrovertible and, in the present situation, crucial fact that if a nuclear war began, it could mean the destruction of human civilization and maybe the end of actual life on earth.

As is well known, on the initiative of the Soviet Union the 36th UN General Assembly session last December declared the first use of nuclear weapons by any state to be an extremely grave crime against mankind.

The USSR's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons thus reflects the will of the international community. It increases the degree of trust among states and makes it easier to reach agreements on limiting, reducing and then completely eliminating nuclear weapons. What a striking contrast with the statements by ranking figures in the American administration regarding U.S. readiness to be the first to resort to the use of nuclear weapons and with their specific actions to modernize strategic offensive forces designed to use such weapons.

Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's message emphasizes that the Soviet Union will continue to shape its policy in the light of how the other nuclear powers behave, of whether they heed the voice of reason and follow the Soviet Union's example or else push the world downhill.

The document that the Soviet delegation has submitted for consideration by the UN General Assembly second special session on disarmament -- the memorandum "To Avert the Growing Nuclear Threat and Curb the Arms Race" -- generalizes both the USSR's principled positions and its most important specific proposals on this problem.

The memoradnum exposes in well-reasoned fashion the U.S. course of stepping up the arms race. This course, the Soviet document stresses, is expressed both in development and mass production of virtually all types of armaments, deployment of weapons at the many American military bases far beyond U.S. territory and extension of the arms race to outer space and in sabotage of talks on a number of important issues whose resolution would lead to a substantial limitation of the arms race and to arms reduction.

The Soviet Union attaches paramount significance to ending the nuclear arms race and eliminating nuclear weapons. The world is well aware of the USSR's proposals on questions of nuclear arms limitation. These include, for instance, the proposals for complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, prohibition of neutron weapons, security guarantees for nonnuclear states, nondeployment of nuclear weapons wherever there are no such weapons now, banning of radiological weapons and creation of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world.

The Soviet memorandum contains a proposal on formulation, adoption and step-by-step implementation of a program of nuclear disarmament. Consistent implementation of specific measures for progress toward this aim is envisaged. First, the memorandum proposes, the sides should cease developing new systems of nuclear weapons. Then the production of fissile material for the purposes of creating various types of nuclear weapons should be ended. The next stage would be to end production of all types of nuclear munitions and delivery vehicles for them. This would make it possible to move on to gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, delivery vehicles included. The final stage would be total elimination of nuclear weapons. The memorandum sets out the Soviet position on the question of limiting and reducing strategic arms and nuclear arms in Europe. The document emphasizes the USSR's readiness to reach agreement on total elimination of all nuclear arms -- strategic, medium-range and tactical. Funds released at each stage of nuclear disarmament would be entirely channeled into peaceful purposes, including aid to developing countries.

Thus implementation of the program of nuclear disarmament proposed by the Soviet Union would lead to elimination of the threat of nuclear catastrophe and to consolidation of the peoples' security. And the process of its implementation would promote economic progress of both developed and the developing states and the upsurge of their peoples' well-being.

The other important initiative that the USSR has put forward at the UN General Assembly second special session on disarmament is aimed at preventing war using another type of weapon of mass destruction -- chemical weapons. The Soviet document "Basic Provisions of a Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction" represents a package of carefully considered measures designed to exclude chemical weapons from the arsenals of the future signatories of the convention. It reflects the accords reached during the Soviet-American talks on prohibiting chemical weapons at the Geneva disarmament committee. It takes into account other states' wishes, including on the issue of monitoring.

The Soviet proposal contains a number of constructive new elements, which, given the political will, makes it possible swiftly and without wasting time to make progress in resolving this important and urgent task. The success of the talks would certainly be greatly promoted by the reaching of an accord on not deploying chemical weapons on other countries' territory right now. Naturally, this convention will be an effective means of limiting the arms race only if a wide range of states take part in it, especially states that possess a large military chemical potential.

Thus by pledging not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and submitting a broad and realistic program for eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons, the Soviet Union has again demonstrated by specific deeds its determination to safeguard peace and to consolidate the security of the world's peoples. The many reactions to the Soviet initiatives and proposals indicate that they are widely supported both among the participants in the General Assembly special session and far beyond that forum. So the attempts by ranking representatives of the U.S. administration to belittle the substance and significance of the new Soviet initiatives and especially the USSR's decision not to be the first to use nuclear weapons look all the stranger.

The Soviet Union's initiatives and proposals set out in Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's message to the UN General Assembly second special session on disarmament and also in Comrade A.A. Gromyko's speech at the session convincingly show the USSR's determination to make a constructive contribution to curbing the arms race and to disarmament. The CPSU and the Soviet state are not slackening their efforts aimed at solving the key problem of our time -- the problem of limiting the arms race and ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear war.

ALLEGATIONS OF SS-20 DEPLOYMENT REFUTED

FRG: U.S. Data Reliable

LD021356 Hamburg DPA in German 1144 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Text] Bonn, 2 Jul (DPA) -- The government stressed on Friday that it thinks that the American data on the stationing of SS-20 medium-range missiles is reliable. The United States and the Soviet Union have made conflicting claims about this in the past.

According to American documents available in Brussels on Wednesday, the Soviet Union deployed a further 15 SS-20 missiles with a total of 45 warheads, even though they had committed themselves to completely end deployment after this date. On Thursday, the Soviet news agency TASS rejected the American figures as malicious slander.

In Bonn on Friday government spokesman Lothar Ruehl pointed to the proven reliability of American data on missiles, data which had for the most part been accepted by the Soviets themselves.

Refutation of FRG Claim

LD031106 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS -- TASS news analyst Ivan Ablamov writes:

The lie of the Reagan administration does not stop being a lie even if it is repeated many times, and even if the lie comes from Bonn where official representative of the FRG Government Lothar Ruehl backed the provocative and malicious fraud of the U.S. Department of State that the USSR, contrary to the announced moratorium, allegedly continues deploying SS-20 missiles in the western part of the country.

It should be emphasized once again that the USSR always honors its word, as different from the U.S. administration which in every step violates its obligations even towards its own allies, as was shown by the actions of the White House after the Versailles meeting.

That the Soviet Union honours fully its obligations refers to the decision to introduce unilaterally a moratorium on deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR. Our country stopped deploying such missiles in the European part of the USSR. It does not deploy additionally missiles which could reach West European countries, and is reducing a considerable number of its missiles.

In a bid to somehow justify the fact that he reiterated deliberately false fabrications of the U.S. Department of State, Lothar Ruehl asserted that allegedly American information is authentic, since, he said, Russians had agreed with the data. It is necessary to note that the official representative takes too much upon himself, speaking not only on behalf of the FRG Government but also on behalf of the Soviet Union. The question naturally arises at what level Ruehl's fabrications were approved?

Viktor Levin Commentary

LD051802 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 5 Jul 82

[Viktor Levin commentary: "The Clumsy Tricks of Washington Propaganda, and Its Advocates"]

[Text] The USSR's peaceful initiatives undertaken recently created a great impression in the international community and aroused a broad response. In the USSR's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, people saw a definite step on the road toward averting nuclear war. The USSR's decision not to site new medium-range missiles on European territory was also highly valued. This decision yet again confirms in deeds and not words our country's sincere striving to free the continent from nuclear weapons.

It is not difficult to imagine that these effective measures aroused confusion in Washington's corridors of power. The attempts to snatch the political initiative have not been successful. President Reagan's empty speech at the UN General Assembly's second special session on disarmament showed that the United States does not intend at all to follow the USSR's good example and pins all its hope on deceiving the public opinion.

With this aim in mind, Burt, U.S. under secretary of state, said that the USSR, despite its announced moratorium, was continuing to site SS-20 missiles in the European part of the country. TASS immediately refuted this slanderous assertion. Washington deemed it not right to enter into the polemics, obviously realizing the total groundlessness of its position. But Washington slanderers, even after the refutation, have found advocates on the Rhine.

As DPA reports, in today's edition of the NEUS OZ OSNABRUCKER ZEITUNG, the foreign policy expert in the Bundestag CDU/CSU faction, Mertes, sucking up to the U.S. under secretary of state, said that the USSR has apparently deceived the West Europeans. In doing this, Mertes bowed and scraped before the government representative, Ruehl, so that he too should repeat the ill-intentioned fabrication of U.S. propaganda.

Naturally, even continuous repetition of lies does not make them true, but the question naturally arises: Why is this being done?

As regards Washington, its position is clear. The U.S. administration is stubbornly comforting itself with hopes of achieving military superiority over the USSR and sees its plans for siting new nuclear weapons in Western Europe as one of the most important components in achieving this end. Hence also the wish to throw a wrench in the works of the talks being held in Geneva on the limitation of medium-range nuclear weapons. However the FRG cannot but be aware, or at least should be aware, that turning its territory into a bridgehead for carrying out the Pentagon's plans for a limited nuclear war hides within it extreme perils. Such a willingness to oblige is not reasonable, and may cost West Germany dearly. Casting a shadow over the USSR's policies is an unreliable activity. After all, it is not without reason that one says you cannot hide the sun with your hand.

MATERIALS ON U.S. MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM

Military Control Timetable

LD031408 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] In 5 years the commander of the U.S. Air Force will largely control all flights of space shuttles. This conclusion can be drawn from the report of the IBM Company published last week. The report says that a special command center will come into operation in Colorado Springs by 1987 to control flights made for military (?projects). Half the flights under the Shuttle Program planned till 1994 will have military objectives. The spaceship Columbia, continuing the last testing flight on Sunday [as heard], has a secret cargo of Pentagon on board [as heard].

Columbia's Military Tests

LD042210 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1738 GMT 4 Jul 82

[Text] New York, 4 Jul (TASS) -- The American space shuttle Columbia has landed at Edwards Air Force Base in the Mojave Desert with Astronauts K. Mattingly and H. Hartsfield on board.

During the 8-day flight, a series of experiments was carried out. Most of them as the U.S. press points out, were of a military nature.

The space craft carried a secret cargo for the Pentagon codenamed DOD-82-1, and the astronauts had specific tasks of a military nature. According to press reports, a space sextant was tested during the flight. It is designed to independently determine coordinates by means of military satellites. A telescope working within an infrared range and scanning sensors for the discovery of "enemy" missiles and space apparatus were also tested. Observers see Columbia's fourth flight as the first definite step in carrying out the U.S. program for the militarization of space.

This is shown, in particular, by the substantial grants allocated by the Pentagon to the Space Shuttle Program. According to the under secretary for the Air Force, Aldridge, by 1987 the military plans to have spent $8.5 billion dollars on this. UPI notes that "every third flight of the shuttle will be of a military character." Surveillance satellites and various types of military technology, including laser equipment, will be put into near-Earth orbit with its help.

Several government departments are now at work carrying out plans for the militarization of space. As of 1 September this year, their efforts will be coordinated by the U.S. Air Force Space Command. "We are now seriously getting down to exploiting the possibilities of near-Earth space," said Brig Gen Randolph, the head of the U.S. Air Force Space Command.

Reagan Speech at Edwards AFB

LD050852 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 5 Jul 82

[Text] Washington, Jul 5, TASS -- TASS correspondent Boris Ivanov reports:

The U.S. administration views outer space to be a potential theatre of military operations and intends to envigorate efforts to develop and deploy "cosmic" types of weapons. This is clearly seen from President Reagan's speech at the welcoming ceremony for the American astronauts, who made a flight in the space shuttle Columbia.

Speaking at the Edwards Air Force Base in California on Sunday, he made a statement on the national policy of the United States in the field of outer space exploration. The President bluntly declared that his administration would be preparing for a war in outer space, that one of the main objectives of the American outer space programme is "a strengthening of the security of the United States." Reagan also said that the USA would continue work for the development and deployment of satellite-killer weapons.

The fact that the Reagan administration has taken course for militarizing outer space is seen, for example, from the fact that the flight of the multiple use Columbia spaceship, which has just been completed, was of a clearly expressed military character. Most of the experiments, which the astronausts carried out in the course of the flight, had been planned at the Pentagon and were top-classified.

The course of actions by the White House is a source of disappointment and mounting criticism from NASA researchers. According to a CBS television company correspondent, representatives of NASA management, who were present while President Reagan delivered his address, were deeply disappointed by the fact that the President as a matter of fact refused to appropriate funds for continuing new outer space research experiments, in particular work for the creation of a research orbital station in outer space.

Further on Reagan Speech

LD052034 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 5 Jul 82

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Vitaliy Sobolev and Anatoliy Doronin]

[Text] Completion of the fourth experimental flight of the Columbia spaceship in the shuttle series has been used by U.S. President Reagan as an occasion for delivering a programmatic speech on the United States' national policy regarding the conquest of outer space. This speech is today being reported and commented upon by many foreign news agencies including the New York TIMES service.

The first thing to attract attention is the fact that the President has openly declared that this administration will prepare for waging war in space, and that this, allegedly, has as its objective strengthening U.S. security. Another thing that is highlighted in many reports is the contrast between the civilian and scientific character of the U.S. space programs at earlier stages and the clearly distinct military character of the space program at present.

In actual fact, having adopted a course aimed at achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union, Reagan's administration regards the militarization of outer space almost as the main means with which to achieve this objective. In these endeavors the shuttle spaceships are being assigned a special role. This is why the Pentagon has ousted NASA — the National Aeronautics and Space Administration — from its place of first rank importance. As reported in the American press, NASA is now expected to become a kind of cabby for the Pentagon. Shuttle spaceships are needed by the American soldiery to deliver cosmic mines and laser weapons into orbit, to set up military space systems which according to the designs of American strategists should radically change the character of a future nuclear war.

One more point deserves mentioning in this connection: The fact that the program of the militarization of outer space has been announced at a moment when the United Nations is holding a disarmament session in New York cannot be regarded as other than a challenge to the demands of peace-loving mankind.

U.S. Plans

PM051111 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 82 p 5

[Anatoliy Pokrovskiy commentary: "For a Weapon-Free Cosmos"]

[Text] More and more reports have recently been emanating from the United States which attest to the fact that Washington intends to extend the arms race into space, too. Thus U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has ordered the development and acquisition within the next 5 years of an antisatellite system. As the New York TIMES noted, this system "can be both nonnuclear and nuclear."

The Pentagon's plans to put laser weapons, spy satellites and all sorts of antisatellite systems into Earth orbit are also known. From the very start of the Shuttle Program the U.S. Defense Department has reserved itself the right to use one-fourth of the Shuttle flights for its own purposes. What is more, the Pentagon has been given control over the projected developments of heavier transport craft based on the Shuttle system. Columbia's fourth flight, planned for July this year, envisages — as is clear from U.S. press reports — the fulfillment of direct military assignments.

U.S. generals do not conceal that they regard space as a potential theater of military operations. According to a U.S. defense secretary aide, the use of space "can have a substantial influence on the course and outcome of armed struggle as a whole." Such plans are fraught with a serious danger for the whole of mankind.

It must also be noted that the U.S. military is attempting to conceal its adventurist plans regarding space by declarations about some sort of "threat" to the United States in this sphere form the USSR. It is relevant to recall that the Soviet Government declared, right after the flight of the world's first cosmonaut Yuriy Gagarin, that it would use space achievements for peaceful purposes only. The Soviet Union initiated the conclusion of an international treaty banning the deployment of any kind of weapon in space. This initiative was supported by many states, and a UN General Assembly session approved it and recommended that the disarmament committee get down to the relevant talks.

Indeed the problem of guarding against the militarization of space brooks no delay. The Pentagon's military plans for space must be rejected and their implementation averted. This is demanded by the peoples of many countries who are concerned for the future of our planet.

Arms Race Impetus

PM060745 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 82 p 5

[Viktor Linnik "Commentator's Column": "Washington's Militarist Orbit"]

[Text] People's attention is now gripped by the most important problem of the present day — how to stop the arms race and avert the threat of nuclear holocaust hanging over mankind. Prominent politicians from many countries and representatives of the world public at large are concerned that the arms race should not spread to new spheres and that its spiral should not extend up into space or down into the world's oceans, whose significance for mankind's peaceful future is growing steadily. Space should serve creative aims, as the joint Soviet-French flight is now graphically demonstrating.

The fourth test launch of the spaceship Columbia in the United States is acquiring an ominous significance against this backdrop. The press believes that it marks the end of "innocent flights" by U.S. astronauts. For the first time a military cargo, whose nature the Pentagon is carefully concealing, has been placed on board the spaceship, which is now in Earth orbit. Thus a qualitative jump is being made in the militarization of NASA which began some time ago. According to U.S. estimates, through 1994 one-half of all Shuttle cargoes will be of a military designation.

The U.S. press is viewing as the latest step in this direction the recent Pentagon decision to set up a special space command within the framework of the U.S. Air Force 1 September this year, which in due course is to fully control the space activity of the various branches of the U.S. Armed Forces. The "space wars" scenarios are now being written not in Hollywood but in the Pentagon, whose laboratories and proving grounds are creating and developing laser and antisatellite weapons. The space-based laser program, according to some estimates, may cost $50-60 billion.

"We are now ready in deed to receive the benefits which space promises us," a Pentagon staffer has said, unable to conceal his satisfaction. It is no coincidence that the Carter administration in its day broke off the talks on limiting or banning antisatellite weapons systems, while the present administration is showing no intention or resuming them.

Flouting world public opinion and the peoples' unequivocally expressed will for peace, Washington is striving to impose on mankind a dangerous new round of arms race. This policy cannot fail to provoke the world community's increasing concern and indigation.

SENATOR CRANSTON CRITICIZES REAGAN ARMS POLICIES

PM051445 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 82 p 5

[TASS report: "A. Cranston Statement"]

[Text] Washington, 23 Jun -- The Reagan administration's militarist course and its lack of a sincere desire to establish control over the arms race have been heavily criticized by A. Cranston, prominent politician and deputy minority leader in the Senate. Addressing a conference of the Democratic Party's Iowa organization in Des Moines, he said that he does not believe that President Reagan and his associates are capable of making the pledges necessary to halt the arms race.

The President, the senator noted, continues to categorically oppose a freeze on nuclear weapons, and his senior advisers are publicly considering the prospect of "preemptive" nuclear strikes and the possibility of a "limited" nuclear war.

Eugene Rostow, who is head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency under Reagan, the senator continued, has said that Japan "in the end not only survived nuclear attack but even began to prosper." Gen E. Rowny and P. Nitze, appointed by Reagan to head U.S. delegations at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, are advocates of the creation of new types of weapons. How can arms control be achieved if it is in the hands of people like this, asked A. Cranston.

The United States, the senator stressed, has created an exceedingly dangerous situation in international affairs. It is the result of years of an incorrect orientation, limited leadership and diplomatic failures. We need leaders who appreciate that you cannot defend our country by means of nuclear war.

CEMA, EEC TRADE, ECONOMIC COOPERATION URGED

LD030656 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS -- The present stage of development in socialist countries of Eastern Europe is characterized by transition from extensive management of the economy, which prevailed in the past, to contemporary intensive economy. This transition in itself is a pointer to a sufficiently high level of industrial development. This was stated in a TRUD interview by Academician Oleg Bogomolov, director of the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System under the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Despite difficulties and huge expenses, the socialist economy is successfully adapting itself to the new situation. The economy in socialist countries develops in a more dynamic way than in countries of the European Economic Community. In 1971-81, for instance, the national income of the CEMA member-countries went up 70 percent, while the EEC countries -- 30 per cent.

Touching upon Western discriminatory restrictions in trade, the Soviet scientist emphasizes that the socialist countries are compelled to take the necessary steps in order to strengthen their technico-economic and technological independence. One cannot overlook the fact, he said, that in the past decade CEMA countries frequently purchased in the West expensive technology which could have well been developed in separate countries or within the framework of CEMA cooperation.

Now in a bid to "punish" the USSR and a number of other CEMA member-countries, new restrictions are introduced on imports from those countries of many commodities, which hampers the payment of earlier granted loans. But it might happen that not so much socialist states as Western countries will find themselves punished.

On the one hand, Oleg Bogomolov points out, the socialist states now stopped entertaining superfluous illusions as to the advantages of industrial cooperation with Western firms. Let alone the constant threat of Western embargo on export of either of the types of equipment, those countries became convinced of a different thing: The West sells as a rule not the latest and up to date technology. By the time it is mastered in CEMA member-countries, it becomes more outdated. Therefore the import of such technology, if the importers are not able to substantially perfect it themselves, does not help strengthen competitive positions in Western markets.

On the other hand, the CEMA member-countries are characterized by a high extent of self-sufficiency not only in energy resources but also in other vitally important raw materials (by 90-95 percent). Meanwhile, the European Economic Community depends 50 percent from imports of fuel from third countries in meeting its energy needs. All that should impel the United States and other Western countries to display greater responsibility and realism in approaching East-West trade-economic cooperation.

WARSAW PACT IDEOLOGICAL WORKERS MEET IN SOFIA

OW251215 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1030 GMT 25 Jun 82

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] A conference of ideological workers and representatives of the Warsaw Pact member states armies' supreme political organs is being held in Sofia.

Colonel General Kosev, chief of the Main Political Administration of the Bulgarian Peoples' Army, addressed the participants with the report "The Education of Soldiers in the Spirit of High Revolutionary Vigilance and Constant Preparedness."

Colonel General Lizichev, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, heads the Soviet delegation of the political workers.

'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM EXAMINES WORLD EVENTS

OW031414 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 0755 GMT 3 Jul 82

["Studio 9" program moderated by Prof Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello comrades. Our regular "Studio 9" program has accumulated many of your letters which pose serious and important questions which I think are of common interest. This is why we have decided to devote today's issue of the program especially to replying to these questions of yours. And I would like to ask Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee, to handle this task.

To facilitate our work we will group your letters according to topic and then we will answer each group of your letters. Now I would like to start with a great many letters received recently -- there are literally thousands of these letters -- in which our television viewers support and approve the important new Soviet initiative contained in the message sent by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev to the second special UN General Assembly session on disarmament, in which on behalf of the Soviet Union the head of the Soviet state pledged not to use, that the Soviet Union will not use, nuclear weapons first.

Soviet Peace Initiative

Now all the letters we are receiving approve of this initiative and unanimously support it, and many authors of these letters ask the question: What consequences can this Soviet initiative have?

[Zamyatin] The problem of preventing nuclear war, and this is the main direction of the policy of our party and our state over a period of many years, can be solved by various means, and the Soviet Union, following the line determined in the peace program, has put forward various proposals which are directed at achieving this aim. Now you remember that there were several of these proposals which in fact envisaged ending the production of nuclear materials for the purpose of nuclear weapons, liquidating nuclear weapons stockpiles, and gradually reducing the number of nuclear weapons as well as liquidating nuclear weapons in general and banning and completely destroying them.

However, all these initiatives were essentially blocked in various organizations, including the United Nations, by the United States and some NATO states which support the U.S. nuclear strategy. On this occasion, at the second special UN General Assembly session which is devoted to disarmament issues, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev put forward a proposal in his message which really coincides with the moods and aspirations of the broadest masses, the broadest levels of the world's public.

Taking into consideration the experience of work with other delegations regarding the proposals which were put forward, so to speak, for the review of states, the Soviet Union in this case went much further, much further. It made a unilateral pledge, namely, that the Soviet Union solemnly declares from the podium of the UN Organization that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons.

You correctly said that this proposal of the Soviet Union, or more accurately this pledge of the Soviet Union, found the most positive response throughout the world, because people see in this an opportunity to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

But what is the essence of this proposal? It is not sufficient that the Soviet Union alone declare its obligation not to use nuclear weapons first. Reciprocal steps are needed from other nuclear states. If they follow this example of the Soviet Union, if every nuclear power pledges on its own initiative not to use nuclear weapons first, then in fact the result of these actions will be equal to the adoption of a proposal on preventing nuclear war. If no country will use it first it follows that there will be no first, second or third nuclear strikes.

The United States wants to prove that nuclear weapons, so to speak, are simply one type of weapon which can be used in war. This is the basis for the theory of the first nuclear strike and the preventive strike. And now we have Weinberger's concept of lengthy protracted nuclear war. And American officials maintain, as they unravel the U.S. nuclear arms program, that the experience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, so to speak, a regrettable experience, shows that, despite the nuclear blows which were delivered, Japan lives and these cities have been restored, the population is hard at work, and so on.

[Zorin] And on an incomparable scale, Leonid Mitrofanovich.

[Zamyatin] You are right. And even the scale is incomparable. But these are such barbarous, cynical and inhumane statements. After all, when the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki how great was the suffering of the people in these two cities. Now they want to subject practically any European city or any American city to these ordeals. This is why the Soviet Union, which understands the entire responsibility which lies on us as one of the nuclear powers, has made such a major step in the foreign policy sphere aimed at bridling the arms race. Presently public and political forces must use all available means to exert influence on politicians and on statesmen of these countries which possess nuclear weapons so that they will take reciprocal steps, so that this proposal, or more accurately, this pledge of the Soviet Union and the pledges of other states if they follow will truly bring about a positive result, the elimination of the possibility of using nuclear weapons in military action, and so forth. In other words, this is an initiative which awaits reciprocal steps.

[Zorin] I would like to continue my question. Leonid Mitrofanovich, by all appearances Washington was taken by surprise by this Soviet initiative. It happened that I was in the assembly hall at the time Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko read out Leonid Ilich's message to the second UN special session on disarmament from that lofty rostrum and saw how, literally, a spontaneous ovation erupted in the hall when Andrey Andreyevich pronounced the words of Leonid Ilich's message. Everyone applauded, all the delegations. The only delegation in the hall that did not react was the U.S. delegation. Their delegates sat staring gloomily at the table with their arms folded. They presented such a sharp contrast to what was happening in the hall at that moment. Well, 2 days after this Soviet statement President Reagan delivered an address from the rostrum of of the General Assembly and could find nothing to say about it.

[Zamyatin] He passed over it in silence.

[Zorin] He passed over this proposal in silence. They were obviously not prepared for this in Washington. Then a few days passed and a certain campaign started in the U.S. press connected with the nuclear tests carried out in the Soviet Union. The essence of this campaign was that these nuclear tests contradicted the pledge that the Soviet Union took upon itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. So, how do you assess this type of reasoning, permit me to say, this type of campaign?

[Zamyatin] You know you explained it correctly that first the U.S. delegation and the U.S. propaganda virtually did not react to this proposal. Afterwards, under pressure from public opinion, the White House had to make a statement on this key question, as it is specifically the essence of the special UN General Assembly session's work and an international problem generally. Then, the U.S. propagandists began to move. At first a proposition immediately appeared that the Soviet Union, in putting forward such a proposal or, more precisely, in making such a pledge wanted to deprive the East of its deterrent facilities, in other words nuclear facilities; and, insofar as the Soviet Union has conventional weapons superiority, it would thereby secure its superiority over the West by putting forward such a pledge.

Subsequently, another proposition was put forward, and which was even reflected in the communique of the NATO session in Bonn, namely, that the West has never planned to be the first to use nuclear weapons, that it only plans to use them against the Soviet Union as a deterrent in the event the United States or its NATO allies are attacked or in the event of some other attack which would threaten the vital interests of the United States.

However, this is first incorrect even in essence because the U.S. concept has been promulgated which envisages it being the first to inflict a nuclear strike, a preemptive strike, and none other than Weinberger spoke about this when, on the eve of NATO's Bonn session he promulgated a document — this information was leaked on purpose — on the nuclear strategy of the United States. This is called the new nuclear strategy. When all this was disclosed — and the correctness of the U.S. position could supposedly be proven by these documents — then the U.S. propagandists.... Usually, this whole campaign of distorting the Soviet Union's position begins, as I always say, from the front door of the White House. Someone from Reagan's circle casts out some kind of completely unverified idea, which is then swept up by U.S. propaganda and is subsequently referred to as fact.

Now, these ordinary tests that the Soviet Union makes of its weapons were quite artificially connected to this idea although the Soviet Union did not violate any agreements and it naturally continues to improve its defensive weapons because the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons does not yet signify that the Soviet Union will not improve its defense, and especially without reciprocal pledges from other states. Thus, connecting this idea to our proposal is far-fetched, and it can in no way belittle the enormous significance of this pledge by the Soviet Union.

Reaction to Haig Resignation

[Zorin] I would like to turn to the next group of questions. Now in the last few days letters have appeared in the "Studio 9" mailbag whose authors ask us to discuss the reasons for U.S. Secretary of State Haig's resignation. Well, if we look at the official statements made in Washington then it should be acknowledged that they are not very, let's say, convincing. Thus at a sudden unscheduled press conference President Reagan said only a few words, announcing that he had accepted U.S. Secretary of State Haig's resignation with a feeling of deep regret, but refused to answer all the questions which were posed by correspondents.

The letter Haig sent to the President says: It has become clear to me in the last few months that U.S. foreign policy is diverging from the policy laid down and thought out by us. Under these circumstances I find it necessary to ask you to accept my resignation.

Well, from such general phrases it is difficult to understand what actually happened, so I would like to ask you, Leonid Mitrofanovich, for your opinion on the reasons for this resignation, insofar as we are not talking about a particular case, not just about the fate of high-ranking Washington official, but about certain large-scale political processes.

[Zamyatin] What is said in Haig's message in reality essentially reflects what happened in regard to his resignation. As he says, definite disagreements between the U.S. President and Haig began to appear in the last few months.

These disagreements are of a tactical nature. The disagreements somehow are related to the harsh policy the Reagan administration is pursuing in a number of major international issues. Reagan's imperialistic ambitions are completely and shamelessly confirmed. At times even Western journalists call it Reagan's pathological diplomacy, which nobody can either predict or analyze.

One policy is replaced by another policy that contradicts what was said by the President perhaps a few hours or days ago, and then the President says something completely different again, something diametrically opposite, on the same large-scale problems. The Western press cites certain details about Haig's resignation, namely, that Haig himself did not expect this to happen; that he was invited to the White House, had an approximately 15-minute talk with the President, after which the President emerged and reported that he must make an important announcement regarding the composition of the Cabinet. Everyone thought, the journalists thought, that he would talk about that embezzler ...

[Zorin interrupts] Labor Secretary Donovan.

[Zamyatin] Labor Secretary Donovan. However, Haig's resignation was announced. As the press reported, 15 minutes later, without commenting on his announcement, the President and his wife left by helicopter to rest at Camp David.

However, this is the external aspect, so to speak, of this question. It is thought that during the U.S. administration's tenure there was definite friction between Haig and the California group which makes up Reagan's inner circle. This includes Deaver and Baker and Meese and lately a new figure has appeared, namely, Clark, the national security adviser. These contradictions became so aggravated that Haig's resignation is being primarily linked with Reagan's recent visit to Europe; that the line adopted in Versailles on the question of mutual economic relations -- this is one of the main points the Western press cites -- was worked out with regard for the interests of U.S. West European NATO allies to their definite mutual satisfaction.

But when Reagan returned to Washington the interests of the California group and its pressure on Reagan won out over the line that was formulated in Versailles with Haig's assistance. This new line is now being called nothing but a solution by the United States of its own economic difficulties and problems at the expense of its West European allies.

The second question which is directly linked to this is the fact that Reagan, after returning to Washington, held a meeting of the National Security Countil without Haig, who was in New York at the time, and a decision was adopted on a program which impedes the Western powers from solving their energy problem through cooperation with the Soviet Union. I have in mind the gas pipes [gastruby] deal.

Reagan made a decision that essentially leads to the fact that now sanctions, at first announced on U.S. deliveries in regard to this project, are also extended to its West European subsidiaries, whose production is carried out in Europe, if they operate either under U.S. licenses or if they are in some way connected with U.S. capital. In essence Reagan is making a decision which interferes in the internal affairs of his allies, in their economies.

This whole set of these problems -- they may be continued -- gave rise to different interpretations, tactical interpretations, on their solution. This led to the California group, having pressured President Reagan, deciding in fact to get rid of a person who was not part of this California circle. Now I would by no means want the television viewers to form the opinion that Haig bears any resemblance to a peacemaker or a dove. He is the same type of harsh person -- a former commander in chief of NATO and a full U.S. general. But in the tactical sense he understood many questions, the tactics for solving these questions, in a different way than the harsh, completely unpredictable policy of Reagan.

[Zorin] I would like to continue the question connected with this resignation. You know that rumors that Haig is considering the possibility of running for president in the 1984 elections have been widely circulated lately in Washington. What do you think? Can there be any connection between Haig's resignation and the possibility that he has such plans?

[Zamyatin] Valentin Sergeyevich, one can only guess here, because I have also seen these reports in the U.S. press. As you remember, Haig also had these ambitions in 1980.

[Zorin] Yes, he did put forward his candidacy.

[Zamyatin] He put forward his candidacy and subsequently withdrew it and accepted the position of secretary of state. It is possible -- this is mere conjecture -- it is possible that Haig is thinking that it is time to disassociate himself from this shameful policy and to somehow use it in his subsequent political aims as a future U.S. public figure. However, this is conjecture.

[Zorin] I understand. And yet another question on the same topic. What do you think: Can the replacement of the U.S. secretary of state bring about any changes in Washington's foreign policy line?

[Zamyatin] Here, too, only time will tell. In any case for the time being the Western press is reporting that this change could led to a hardening of Reagan's policy, an even greater hardening. It is not excluded that this will also spread to economic sanctions, and will also affect both West European countries and Japan as the closest competitors of the United States. This is not so much an economic question now as a political question.

On the other hand, they stress that Shultz, who has now taken up the position of secretary of state, also essentially comes from the California group, although at one time he was part of the Nixon administration and occupied a number of Cabinet positions. He then became director of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget and later returned to one of the largest construction companies of California which, according to my information -- I looked up some references is connected with the oil-producing industry in Saudi Arabia -- it is typical that Weinberger also came from the same company -- I mean the construction company. Therefore on the basis of these facts alone it is presently premature to talk about any changes one way or the other.

Mideast Situation Explored

[Zorin] There is a large group of letters I would like to go on to and to ask you, Leonid Mitrofanovich, to dwell on the questions posed in them, connected with the situation in the Near East. Television viewers Aleksey Alekseyevich Bogdanov from Leningrad, Poplavskiy, an engineer from Novosibirsk, and other television viewers sharply condemn Israel's latest aggression in their letters and write that it creates a new situation in the Near East. Do you agree with this assessment and how do you generally assess the present situation in this region?

[Zamyatin] To say that the new situation.... We must divide here what we see as new and what remains the same. I will begin with what remains the same, namely, the fact that Lebanon has become the latest victim of Israeli aggression in line with a policy which was jointly worked out by the United States and Israel during the Camp David period, a policy directed primarily at breaking the unity of the Arab countries, undermining the united front of Arab countries and gradually breaking one Arab state after another away from this front.

At first Egypt found itself outside this resistance front, so to speak. Then the creation of a Palestinian state, or the creation of Palestinian autonomy as it was called, became a tactical problem for the United States and Israel and an obstacle to the realization of the Camp David accords. Begin and the United States solved this problem in their own way, by military force. The aggression in Lebanon was not hatched in a day. It was a carefully worked out plan. Its initiator was Israeli Defense Minister Sharon, who, on the eve of the invasion, visited the United States, where he received final good wishes, so to speak, for realizing this plan. Then large massed tank formations struck across the Lebanese border and began their operation aimed at destroying the Arab people of Palestine.

Herein is the issue. The new element in the Near East situation is the beginning of the physical destruction of the 2 million strong Palestinian people, who, since 1947, when the decision to establish two states in Palestine, namely, Israel and an Arab state of Palestine, was adopted -- the first part of this decision was fulfilled but the second was not -- these Arab people of Palestine have been deprived of a home, of land, and of administrative organs of their own and have been dispersed essentially throughout all the Arab countries. And so nearly 1 million people found themselves in the south of Lebanon in Palestinian camps.

In order to imagine the scale of this military operation -- it was called Cedars of Lebanon -- it is sufficient to cite the following example. More than 500 Israeli tanks invaded Lebanese territory simultaneously across Lebanon's southern border. The Israelis themselves admit that eight armored tank brigades and five mechanized motor brigades are currently engaged in combat operation in Lebanon. To see how these military actions of the aggressor were carried out and how this plan was developed we can return to a map of these military actions, the map which was published in the U.S. TIME magazine [21 June issue]. From one side, from the territory of Israel, as it is shown here, tank columns are moving through corridors formed between places of UN troops deployment. From the other side there is a flanking maneuver by other tank units moving toward the Al-biqa' Valley where the Syrian troops of the inter-Arab forces are deployed, and the third invasion group moves from the sea striking separate cities. Here you see a number of cities along the cost. Here troops were landed from the sea and these settlements were bombarded by naval artillery and by aircraft, and essentially this large-scale rapid invasion was not coincidentally called the Israeli blitz, as you can see on the cover of TIME magazine. This blitz was supposed to go for 3 days, yet a month has already passed since the Israeli Army began its bloody slaughter on Lebanese territory.

[Zorin] Nothing came of this blitz.

[Zamyatin] Nothing came of the blitz as a result of the determination of the Palestine Resistance movement and as a result of the determination of the national patriotic forces of Lebanon who for the first 3 days — 6, 7 and 8 June — and part of 9 June, were essentially the only Arab forces in Lebanon to receive the entire powerful blow of the Israeli Army, which really perpetrated a bloody slaughter on this territory against the peaceful population. Nearly 30,000 civilians were killed in southern Lebanon because the policy was aimed at annihilating the Arab people of Palestine in order to settle accounts with these people and to eliminate them in general as a force from a political settlement in the Near East.

To confirm what I have said I would like to make use of one of Begin's statements which was made — I found it in our archives — 5 years ago. Permit me to read it. The foundations of the Israeli expansionists' policies were already being laid at that time, together with the United States, against this movement which, so to speak, impeded the realization of the Israeli expansionist plans through its political actions. Anyway, at the time Begin said, and I quote: We must understand that there is no room in this country for two peoples — he is talking about Lebanon — and the only solution is a Palestine without Arabs. No other way exists than the deportation of the Arabs to neighboring countries, all of them, without exception. Not a single village or a single tribe should remain here. Now isn't this the policy which is being pursued at present, a policy of annihilation and genocide?

[Zorin] A policy which was planned and conceived ahead of time.

[Zamyatin] Conceived and planned, and now it is introducing a new element into the Near East because the Israeli aggression against the Arab people of Palestine and the policy of their complete annihilation is continuing.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich. Well, now the figures of the enormous forces which Israel threw against the Palestinians to some extent explains the course of military events. Nonetheless I would like to ask you to reply to the question: What are the reasons for the defeats suffered by the Palestinians during the combat operations? There is a lot of speculation in the Western press at the moment on this. In particular some press organs are talking about the superiority of the weapons used by Israel. It is known that these are American weapons. There is also other speculation. Now, what could you say about the reasons for the difficult situation in which the Palestinian Resistance movement detachments found themselves?

[Zamyatin] First of all, the fact that the Palestinian Resistance movement, against which the first strike was directed, did not expect this strike because the aggression was sudden. The aggression was prepared but, as usual, in conducting his attack the aggressor has definite advantages. Second, the Palestinian Resistance movement and the national patriotic forces which met the blow in the south did not possess the kinds of weapons which could withstand these powerful tank and armored formations.

[Zorin] They were in fact guerrilla detachments.

[Zamyatin] They are detachments armed with rifles and light artillery pieces and mainly weapons for defending those Palestinian refugees and camps situated in the south of Lebanon from various kinds of bandit attacks which have been carried out periodically throughout the existence of these Palestinian camps. And therefore the entire force, so to speak, was thrown back, and this is why the Israelis managed to reach the outskirts of west Beirut, its Muslim quarter, in 3 days, and surround it and put a blockade around Lebanon [as heard] and to threaten the Lebanese capital with the destruction of western Beirut if the Palestinian forces and their leadership do not capitulate, if they do not give up their arms.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Political problems are not solved with military acts. It can be said that the knot in the Near East has been drawn even tighter and it is impossible to find a solution on the path which Washington and Tel Aviv are following in their attempt to solve these problems.

Geneva Arms Talks Viewed

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, I would now like to ask you to dwell on yet another group of letters we have received recently. Soviet-U.S. talks on problems of strategic arms limitation began this week. Well, many of our television viewers raise the question: Well, what can be expected from these talks?

[Zamyatin] We went to these talks anticipating that they could lead and, more precisely, must lead to a substantial reduction of the most dangerous means — strategic nuclear missile facilities [sushchestvennomu sokrashcheniyu naiboleye opasnykh sredstv, raketno-yadernykh sredstv strategicheskogo naznacheniya]. The fact that the Soviet Union at one time signed an agreement with the United States on strategic arms limitation known to everyone as the SALT-II agreement, indicates that the Soviet Union's desires and intentions in this area are most sincere, and if it did not come into force then it was not the Soviet Union's fault.

We consider that the Geneva talks can present an opportunity to work out an arrangement, an agreement that would lead to strategic arms reduction and at the same time establish effective qualitative limitations. However, in order to do this each side at these talks must proceed from a basic principle, namely, that these talks not provide either side an opportunity to solve its own problems at the expense of infringing on the other side's security.

U.S. Stance 'Not Acceptable'

The talks have begun but an official statement by the U.S. President in which he set out the U.S. concept of these talks preceded them. This concept is unacceptable and is not in accordance with the principle about which I just spoke, because the United States first and foremost is trying to push land-based strategic facilities and sea-based facilities into the foreground.

If we look at the proposals with which the United States came to these talks, which U.S. President Reagan outlined, then land-based ballistic missiles and sea-based ballistic missiles are within the first stage of reduction. Missiles carried by aircraft, cruise missiles and so on are excluded. This is not an accidental choice by the United States, because our strategic missile structure differs from the U.S. structure. And when it is proposed to reduce land-based missile warheads first, then the United States is proceeding from the fact that approximately 70 percent of the Soviet Union's warheads are on land-based weapons, as against only 20 percent in the United States. In other words, all the rest are based on other facilities for delivering these weapons.

Now if the talks are begun from this, and they are accepted, then the Soviet defense ability and the principle of equal security, of identical security, which is the only basis for these talks, would immediately be disrupted. What was the United States pursuing, judging by the promotion of Reagan's proposal? To break the Soviet defense structure, and the Soviet land-based missile forces and make us rebuild this system, and at the same time produce a sharp reduction, approximately threefold, in our available defense ability, that is, land-based facilities for delivering ballistic missile weapons. Such an approach is not acceptable to us.

[Zorin] In the last few days preceding the talks not only certain Western press organs but also certain public figures have expressed, well, I would say, a certain distinctly artificial optimism in regard to the fact that the talks are beginning. What do you make of this?

[Zamyatin] You know Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko explained this very well at his press conference. He said that the fact that certain state figures are now setting their hopes on the fact that the talks themselves have begun, is a big factor in international life. Indeed we also attach great importance to the fact that the talks have begun. But one cannot just speak about the beginning of the talks and put aside the fact that these talks must lead to the essence of the question's solution, so that a definite and final result is reached, and reached in the shortest possible time. Otherwise, these talks could go on for 5 or 10 years while at the same time the arms race may continue to be intensified.

In fact that is how it would turn out according to the U.S. plan. If this first stage of reducing land-based ballistic missiles is adopted, then we, the Soviet Union, would be reducing warheads while the United States, at the same time, would be increasing the potential of their long-range MX missiles, with their nuclear warheads aimed at the Soviet Union.

Here, so to speak, is the essence and the aim of the talks. Thus maximum efforts should really be made so that they are crowned with concrete results, so that they produce concrete results. And not only the efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States must be aimed at this but also those of political leaders who express satisfaction with the first stage of the beginning of talks. They must exert corresponding influence so that the talks will be effective from the point of view of results.

Falklands Dispute Reviewed

[Zorin] Another group of questions. The military activities in the Falkland Islands have ended. London is noisily celebrating victory. Many television viewers are asking the question: What next? Can the Anglo-Argentine conflict be considered ended?

[Zamyatin] You know it is difficult to consider that this conflict has ended because although Britain forced the garrison in the Falklands to capitulate it did not win a victory there. It got problems. It got problems which will be encountered for many years by both Britain and the United States insofar as it supports these colonial and imperial aspirations of the British Government, which essentially threw away a considerable part of its fleet in order to seize this small handful of earth and leave the British flag there untouched.

A big price was paid, but one thing is important, that in this Falklands crisis the contradictions which exist in the world as a result of these global imperial aspirations of the United States and some of its military allies in the NATO bloc were revealed. This is a return to colonialism. After all, what did Britain fight for? In order to establish its colonial order in these islands and to prevent the opportunity for these islands to acquire national independence.

What can happen now? The British have announced that a joint U.S.-British naval base modeled after Diego Garcia will be established there which essentially will control the south of Africa and the Latin American countries. In other words, as a result of this Falklands or Malvinas conflict these countries have seen with their own eyes that after all the threat to these countries stems not from that mythical version of a Soviet military threat or from Soviet military intrusion which was foisted on them for many years but the threat stems from the imperialist states, yesterday's colonizers, which are banding together so as not to give the national liberation tendencies a chance to develop in the previously dependent or colonial territories. But this goes counter to the historical process which has been implemented, so to speak, for almost 20 years.

This is what the Falklands conflict represents. And its political outcome and the result Britain gets and which it will encounter in the future can already be seen. It will encounter the national liberation movement of Argentina for the liberation of these islands.

Growing Antiwar Movement

[Zorin] Thank you. And in conclusion I would like to ask the following question. One of the most important factors in current events is the enormous wave of the antiwar movement both in Western Europe and in the United States. I had the opportunity to observe in New York on 12 June an absolutely grandiose antiwar demonstration in which more than a million people participated. Nothing like it has ever occurred in America and this movement is gaining strength in Japan and Western Europe. Now in this connection, our television viewers, who are informed about the scope of the antiwar movement, ask the following questions: Does this movement have any kind of real influence on the policies of governments — Western ones first of all and on Washington — and what real political action can this antiwar movement, which is so broad in scope, have?

[Zamyatin] You know what is presently characteristic of this movement. Primarily it is the understanding of the people that a nuclear threat hangs over the world and that it is a real threat in light of the nuclear policy pursued by the Reagan administration. People have felt for the first time that rattling nuclear weapons and various theories of their application create the possibility for a real nuclear conflict.

They have also felt that this nuclear conflict may threaten life on earth for both present and future generations. What happened in Hiroshima and Nagasaki is clear to the people. If, say, a bomb of only 12 kilotons was dropped on Hiroshima and yet a total of nearly 300,000 people died, both immediately after the blast and subsequently from nuclear radiation, then what of present calculations when countries already possess thousands of times more powerful charges for nuclear bombs than the Hiroshima bomb whose power is already reckoned not in kilotons but in megatons? This is why people who see this danger are demonstrating and protesting. This movement is acquiring an unprecedentedly enormous scale.

What strength does it have? First of all it has the strength of moral influence — influence on those countries and on those statesmen whom this concerns, primarily the American leadership. Even in America, where Reagan did not believe the emergence of this movement was possible, a million-strong demonstration of people from all walks of life, from all levels of society, was held, including the younger generation that knows that they must live tomorrow. They want to live in conditions of peace and not in conditions of Reagan's saber rattling.

It is this moral influence which must produce a very great effect on all those plans which are being elaborated and nurtured by the warmongers. The Soviet Union is taking enormous measures, and we have spoken of this today in this program, in order to eliminate the possibility of a nuclear war. The entire policy of our party and our state is predicated on this and our position is in harmony with the moods of the world's people, and therein lies its even greater strength.

[Zorin] Thank you. Our time on the air has run out. It remains for me to thank you, Leonid Mitrofanovich, for your interesting replies to our television viewers' questions, and to thank you, comrades, for your attention. And so until our next meeting here in our Studio 9. Thank you.

'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE' FOR 4 JULY

LD041440 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 4 Jul 82

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Pavel Yepifanovich Demchenko, member of the PRAVDA editorial board; Vladimir Borisovich Lomeyko, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political observer; and Gennadiy Mikhaylovich Ariyevich, all-union radio international affairs department commentator]

[Text] [Ariyevich] Hello, esteemed comrades. The numerous reports from all parts of the world received here in the editorial offices are vivid evidence of the deep impression created in the world by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's message to the UN General Assembly's second special session on disarmament, and the obligation announced in it to the effect that the Soviet Union will not be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Our country has made this step in an act of confidence in the power of commonsense, unilaterally, and without any preconditions, in order to give a good example. If only the other nuclear powers would follow with measures like this by the Soviet Union then the probability of a nuclear war starting would be reduced to zero. If there is no first nuclear strike there is no need for further strikes. The Soviet initiative, which makes it possible to take a fresh look at the entire complex of problems connected with disarmament, is bound to become a powerful positive stimulus also for the Soviet-American talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments which were resumed this week in Geneva.

Arms Stance Outlined

[Demchenko] As regards the principled position of our side, it was clearly presented by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev. He said that in order to achieve a successful conclusion at the talks and reach an agreement, it is necessary first to strive toward limiting and reducing the strategic armaments and not to make use of the talks as a cover for continuing the arms race and disturbing the existing parity. Second, it is necessary to conduct the talks while taking into consideration the legitimate security interests of the other side and in strict conformity with the principle of equality and equal security. Third, it is necessary to preserve all the positive aspects which have been already achieved.

[Lomeyko] However, until the very eve of the talks opening statements were being voiced in Washington to the effect that the United States does not intend abandoning the plans for a so-called modernization of its strategic nuclear forces, which basically means an attempt to change the existing correlation of forces to the advantage of the United States.

[Ariyevich] Of course, the success of the talks will require efforts by both sides. In this connection observers have drawn attention to the message contained in the letter of instructions which President Reagan sent to the leader of the American delegation at the talks, retired Army Lt Gen Edward Rowny. This letter contains, on the one hand, a call to make use of this historic opportunity, while at the same time he is making an ill-founded attempt to place the responsibility for the continuation of the arms race upon the Soviet Union. In doing this, the President is taking the land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles out of the over-all context of strategic balance between the USSR and the United States. It is through reductions in precisely this kind of weapons -- where they consider we have superiority -- while at the same time leaving unaffected the systems where the United States has the superiority that they are seeking to obtain de facto unilateral disarmament of our country.

[Lomeyko] Such an approach is, of course, without prospects of success. The Soviet delegation will be working toward reaching such a solution at the talks which would truly serve the strengthening of international stability. The Soviet Union would like to see a Soviet-American agreement which provides for a substantial mutual quantitative reduction in strategic armaments, while at the same time establishing an effective limitation to their qualitative improvement.

[Ariyevich] In the West these days there is a sense of restrained optimism, as they say. Thus THE GUARDIAN in Britain said: This time there is no great euphoria but plenty of hope. There is a feeling of relief that the talks were resumed after all. THE FINANCIAL TIMES, again in Britain, notes that the talks represent an important link in the chain of efforts to establish control over armaments, which to a considerable degree results from the growth of the antiwar movement in the West.

The unprecedented upsurge in this movement has also been a major cause for the present discord between the West European countries and the United States, and mainly concerning the issue of East-West relations, don't you think so?

Strained U.S.-NATO Relations

[Lomeyko] What is currently happening in the relations between the United States and its allies in West Europe can be fully appreciated only with reference to the global strategy of American imperialism.

Observers in many countries now write and talk about an unprecedentedly serious and acute flare-up of contradictions between Washington and the capitals of West European states. The latest cause has been identified as the U.S. administration's decision to extend and expand the ban on supplying American equipment made under U.S. license for the construction of the west Siberia - West Europe gas pipeline. The majority of NATO countries have expressed complete disagreement.

[Ariyevich] To this must be added the protest by the Japanese Government in connection with the U.S. ban on exports to the USSR of modern technology and equipment for the oil and gas deposits. This decision hits a project of great importance to Japan: participation in the mastering of oil resources from the continental shelf in the Sakhalin region.

[Lomeyko] This, too, is a most substantial circumstance which goes to show that in the mighty triumvirate of the United States, West Europe and Japan, Washington in its role of the chief wrestling partner has delivered a backheel simultaneously to both its allies in global policy. They may be allies, but they are also competitors in trade and economic matters.

[Ariyevich] As you just said, Vladimir Borisovich, they are competitors. Indeed this factor appears to be decisive. In the final analysis the United States, West Europe and Japan are interlinked by close economic ties, not to mention the military-strategic interests of international imperialism.

[Lomeyko] This is so. However, the American sanctions, and the reaction against them by the U.S. allies, should be approached as part of an elaborate complex of interconnected causes. Also we must always bear in mind the chief strategic policy of the United States. This was formulated during the late 1970s and early 1980s, not by Carter or even by Reagan, but rather by the very real though unattributed power represented by that section of the financial-industrial oligarchy of the United States which is currently calling the tune in American politics in the delineation of its strategic direction. This includes the most aggressive circles in the military-industrial complex which in the late 1970s embarked on a course of achieving U.S. military-strategic superiority in the world. This involves first of all the attempt to achieve superiority over the USSR, and second to secure the unconditional submission of the allies according to the rules: Line up behind Washington and march off as ordered. As concerns the gas-for-pipes project, the Americans have been trying from the very beginning at least to slow down, if not prevent, its realization. This was done through press statements as well as through pressure exercised when high-placed delegations were dispatched to Europe to conduct explanatory work.

U.S. Sanctions on Gas Pipeline

[Ariyevich] Indeed, this practice is continuing to this day. For instance, the week-long north European tour of U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Perle has just ended. In Oslo, he proposed that the Norwegians supply their own gas to Western Europe with the sole purpose of wrecking the construction of the west Siberia-West Europe gas pipeline.

[Lomeyko] Yes, I think these attempts are to continue further. Chancellor Schmidt, the French leaders, the Italians, even the British have repeatedly explained to the Americans that this project means long-term orders for them and therefore jobs for tens of thousands of people. In addition, for many countries in Western Europe this project means fuel. According to the agreement, beginning in 1984 there should be billions of cubic meters of natural gas supplied annually to the FRG, France, Italy and other countries. By the end of the century the volume of supplies should rise to 40 billion cubic meters of gas.

However, having listened to all these arguments Washington not only did not take account of these vitally important interest of its partners but quite the opposite. It began to twist their arms. At first there was a heavy psychological attack which is still going on.

It was stated that the gas pipeline with Western participation means an economic boost for the Soviet Union and therefore a boost for the growth of its military potential, and also that without help from the West the Soviet Union is not capable of completing this project, as they said. A second argument was also put into circulation: that the realization of the deal would put Western Europe in a position of dependence on Moscow.

[Ariyevich] As concerns this second claim, this is simply absurd. However important Soviet gas may be for the West, its share in the power balance of the importing countries will not go beyond 5 percent. On the other hand, wrecking the project will painfully hit many Western firms which should supply equipment for compressor stations, particularly companies like the West German AEG Telefunken, the Italian Nuove Pignione and the British John Brown Engineering. In case the deal falls through, at the AEG Telefunken enterprises between 20-25,000 jobs will be lost. In Western Europe generally, more than 100,000 jobs will have to go.

[Lomeyko] To return to the first argument used by the enemies of the deal, it too can withstand no criticism. Many Western specialists and politicians have admitted that the Soviet Union is capable of realizing the project with its own efforts. This is because this export gas pipeline is only one among six technically analogous gas pipelines being constructed in our country in the current 5-year period. Generally speaking, any calculations based on attempts to exercise diktat toward the Soviet Union and the socialist community with respect to their policies, from a position of force, any such calculations have long been doomed to failure. This is even more so now after the socialist community has achieved decisive successes particularly in the sphere of economic development of the countries concerned. Already many Western specialists and many politicians feel that the very principle of such an approach to the socialist community -- calculated to bring it to its knees -- will come to nothing. Indeed Haig, too, spoke about this in his time when he was trying to explain to Reagan why such a approach is sure to fail and will have a detrimental effect more on the West European allies than on the socialist countries.

[Demchenko] I would like to draw attention to a very significant circumstance. Right now, Soviet press, radio and television are carrying reports that in a number of works, large Soviet machine-tool building works, workers' meetings are taking place where engineers and workers undertake to speed up the production of the same kind of equipment around which there have been difficulties in exports from the West.

[Ariyevich] Still, in my opinion, one should not underestimate the harmful nature of the Washington sanctions.

[Lomeyko] Undoubtedly, they are harmful first of all to international economic cooperation which profits all participants on the basis of labor division and cooperation.

[Ariyevich] But these sanctions are even more harmful to the West Europeans. It was not without reason that the leaders of the Ten, during the recent Brussels session of the European council declared the inadmissibility of U.S. interference in the progress of the deal on supplying Soviet gas to Western Europe. The West Europeans intend to contest the legality of the sanctions in the European court. The firms affected are seeking alternative solutions. The French president described the U.S. action as coercive; FRG will not allow a trade war with the USSR to develop. Even Margaret Thatcher gave instructions that the enterprises which are subsidiaries of U.S. firms may not observe the Reagan orders. As the European council session demonstrated, a clash of interests was registered there in the positions of Washington and the Common Market.

[Lomeyko] It is important to emphasize here that all this is not a matter of controversy on a particular issue but rather an important difference in principle in the approach to contemporary development in the world. Is it to be a course of confrontation or is it to be a course of detente and cooperation? Washington has elected the first road. Its allies, despite the shared anticommunist feelings, do not want to exchange detente for a new variety of the cold war.

In this sense, the West Europeans do not share in the strategic stance of the present administration which has given itself the impossible objective — either to force the USSR to capitulate and accept the U.S. conditions or to undermine its social order through continuing the arms race and economic sanctions. However, this is a task beyond the capacity of the administration. In the race for world leadership, the most aggressive circles in the United States have raised a hand not only against the socialist countries but also have been bitterly offending their allies, as their reaction shows.

Events in Lebanon

[Ariyevich] This reaction was also shown in regard to the events in Lebanon which confirmed that the invasion by Israeli forces could only have taken place with the knowledge and encouragement of Washington. In discussing the question of Israeli aggression in Lebanon at the Brussels session of the Common Market, the West European countries resolutely condemned this invasion and expressed concern about the situation in Lebanon.

[Demchenko] If you speak of reaction in the world as a whole to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the first thing that strikes you is the isolation in which the aggressor and Washington behind him find themselves. This is shown by the statement of the heads of the 10 West European states and governments in Brussels and probably even more clearly by the voting in the UN General Assembly on the Palestinian question. Only two delegations voted against a resolution condemning the aggression -- Israel and the United States -- with 127 votes in favor. This was an unprecedented occurrence.

It would be hard to cite an example of a greater defeat for Washington's diplomacy and that of its Near East gendarme, Israel, in the international field. As the Paris paper L'HUMANITE writes, never before in its history has U.S. diplomacy been so isolated. The U.S. position has been condemned not only in the outside world but also in the United States itself, the paper writes. It is thus clear that in continuing its criminal actions and in being so contemptuous of its Arab neighbors, the aggressor is throwing down a challenge to the entire international community.

[Ariyevich] This is also shown by a mighty wave of protest which has occurred in many countries. There have been meetings and demonstrations in Paris, Vienna and New York. In the Soviet Union, as everywhere in the world, the working people resolutely condemn the banditry perpetrated by the Zionists, the annihilation of thousands of Palestinians and Lebanese the attempts to bring an entire people to its knees, to impose the aggressor's will on them by force of arms.

[Demcheno] Yes, Gennadiy Mikhaylovich, expressly by force of arms. The losses from the Israeli aggression are very great. Al-Wazzan, the Lebanese prime minister has just stated that the number of dead in the country has reached 15,000 and there are more than 50,000 wounded. Israeli forces have occupied about 1/3 of the country. This is something over 3,000 sq km. They have surrounded Beirut from the south and east and the approaches to it from the Mediterranean are blockaded by Israeli naval forces. For about 20 km, Israeli forces control the highway from Beirut to the Syrian capital of Damascus.

[Ariyevich] By the way, Pavel Yerifanovich, the concepts of west and east Beirut have been gaining political currency recently. It appears that this refers not simply to the georgraphical locations of the regions, do you not agree?

[Demchenko] Yes.

[Ariyevich] It would be a good thing if you would explain this in more detail to our listeners.

[Demochenko] The point is that since 1975, i.e since the civil war in Lebanon, the city has been split into two parts. The eastern part is controlled by the rightwing Christian forces headed by Pierre al-Jumayyil and his son Bashir. They have been actively cooperating with Americans and Israelis and are still doing so now. The western part is held by the national patriotic forces. There are also five Palestinian refuge camps there and centers of the PLO.

Palestinian detachments which have retreated from the south have ended up in west Beirut, along with hundreds of thousands of refugees. It was west Beirut which was subjected to barbarous bombing and destruction, with a large number of deaths caused. Many blocks have been destroyed. The original inhabitants have abandoned their homes to find refuge in the northern part of Lebanon. The capitulation of west Beirut is demanded by Israel under the threat of its destruction.

In this connection I should like to recall the aims of Israeli aggression in Lebanon, although they have been mentioned often in our press and on radio and television: first, to inflict a defeat on the PLO, the combat centers and main bases of which, as we have stated, are located on Lebanese territory. This organization heads the struggle of the 4 million Palestinian people to create their own state. But Israel has set itself the task of preventing the appearance of such a state and wants to annex all the Palestinian lands, namely the west bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip, a total area of about 6,000 sq km. These territories were occupied in 1967. The defeat of the PLO would enable Israel to achieve its aims.

Second, the plan is to create a government in Lebanon which will agree to cooperate with Israel. Finally, the Israeli rulers are striving to weaken Syria, which supports the Palestinians, pursues an anti-imperialist, anti-American policy and is striving for the liberation of the Golan Heights seized from it in 1967. It is not difficult to understand that all these aims are in accordance with the strategic concepts of U.S. imperialism, which dreams of turning the Near East into a major military strategic bridgehead. It is not by chance, therefore, that Washington's behavior, both in the period preceding the aggression and since it has begun, has included not only total support for Israel but also participation in the aggression.

[Lomeyko] By the way, Reagan and his assistants are naturally dissociating themselves in every way from any such participation. At his last press conference, Reagan tried to evade responsibility, saying that it was not he who gave the green light for Israeli aggression, that it caught him unawares like everybody else. But how can one call this unexpected, or a surprise when on the very eve of Israel's aggression in Lebanon, Sharon, the Israeli defense minister, visited the United States and had detailed talks there? After the invasion had begun, Premier Begin was received with honor in Washington. Can one believe that this ceremonial meeting was organized as a reward for the Lebanon surprise?

[Ariyevich] Well, even at the press conference itself, U.S. journalists were not much inclined to believe Reagan's assertions that he knew nothing of Tel Aviv's plans. When Reagan set out his own basic aims in the Near East, namely the creation of a new central government in Lebanon, the withdrawal of foreign forces from the country, particularly Syrian forces forming the inter-Arab force, and also the PLO forces, U.S. journalists commented that the aims and policy of the United States and Israel in the Near East coincide totally. What about the reaction of the Arab world to the invasion?

Reaction in the Arab World

[Demchenko] It should be said that this reaction is not uniform, although all the Arab governments in principle condemned the aggression. The press is now full of anti-imperialist and anti-American articles, commentaries and statements. The ordinary Arabs are full of wrath. But not all by any means are proving practical, real help to the Palestinians, Syrians and progressive Lebanese forces. According to reports from Damascus, military units have arrived there from Democratic Yemen, and small detachments of volunteers from a number of other countries. That is about all.

[Ariyevich] And from Iran, too.

[Demchenko] Yes, about 500 I think. The Palestinians are also receiving money, mainly so-called humanitarian aid: food, medical supplies, blankets and tents. Some volunteer medical detachments have also gotten through to Beirut. They are working selflessly there.

[Ariyevich] Pavel Yepifanovich, does it not seem to you that this reaction is somewhat weak? After all, the Arab League, unlike in 1967 and 1973, was even unable to meet at an appropriate level to take effective measures against the aggressor.

[Demchenko] Regrettably, this is indeed the case. The Arab world is split as never before. The Camp David agreements took Egypt out of the anti-imperialist struggle. Iraq is bogged down in a fratricidal war with Iran. Morocco is trying to bring West Sahara under its control. Nor should we forget that the PLO, Lebanese patriotic forces and Syria, are all links in the Near East. The conservative, semifeudal regimes, of which there are quite a few on Arab soil, are in no hurry at all to come to their aid; rather the reverse. So it turns out that ordinary people everywhere are indignant. The governments issue bombastic statements but often not supported by deeds.

[Ariyevich] The impression may be gained that as a result of the Israeli aggression and American interference in Lebanese affairs — Habib, the representative of the U.S. President, is constantly in Beirut — the PLO is in an extremely difficult situation. Israeli Defense Minister Sharon, speaking in this connection, frankly declared: We have decided that the PLO should exist no longer, it must be destroyed. To do this, reliance is placed in brute force, international brigandage and real genocide. Isaeli forces, using weapons obtained from across the ocean, including such barbarous means of waging war as pellet and d-phosphorus bombs made in the United States, napalm and poisonous substances, are trying to drown in blood the Palestinian people's struggle for political rights.

[Demchenko] Gennadiy Mikhaylovich, you have put a very important question, which concerns many people at present. I should like to answer it thus: The Palestinians number 4 million. It is not possible to destroy the Palestinian people, and it is equally impossible to break their will for liberty and independence. The Palestinian liberation movement in recent years has reached quite a high degree of maturity and organization. It is recognized by the international community. It is backed by decisions of the United Nations, which has frequently confirmed the complete legitimacy of the demands of the Palestinian Arabs to resolve their own fate, to the point of creating their own state. Certainly they will have to change their form of struggle now. But I am convinced that the national Palestinian movement cannot die. It will undoubtedly continue and force both the Israeli aggressor and its American patrons to take account of it.

[Ariyevich] The course of the American administration for encouraging the Israeli aggressors, undermining relations between West and East and its action in other international matters are causing open discontent in the world, increasing condemnation and counteraction. We have already noted that never before within the UN walls has Washington been in such isolation as at the seventh extraordinary session of the General Assembly on the Palestinian question. American diplomacy now faces considerable effort in trying to find a worthy way of restoring its spoiled relations with Latin America on account of its one-sided support for the British military adventure in the South Atlantic.

Haig Departure Viewed

We have already spoken of the deepening contradictions between Washington and the EEC countries. Disagreement is also increasing within the administration itself. This was reflected, to all appearances, in the resignation of Alexander Haig from the post of U.S. secretary of state.

He had long complained that a partisan war was being waged against him in the White House to prevent him carrying out his duties. Some observers consider that Reagan, who has recently been rapidly losing ground according to the opinion polls, made a scapegoat of him. But I think you, Vladimir Borisovich, have another viewpoint on this question, have you not?

[Lomeyko] Yes, I believe that Haig is not the sort of man for whom other people alone can decide things. Certainly the struggle against him in Reagan's immediate entourage played its part in his departure, but I believe Haig came to the conclusion that Reagan was hardly likely to stand, let alone win, for a second time in the presidential election. So in order not to sink with him, he decided to get out in good time.

[Ariyevich] I should like to add that it is not impossible, according to the American press, that Haig himself may stand as a candidate at the next presidential election.

[Lomeyko] Yes, I had this in mind; I agree with you.

[Ariyevich] But it is, of course, of primary importance for us that Haig's departure denotes misfortune in the Washington foreign policy kitchen. Just take a look at it. Some journalists and politicians are sending flattering compliments after the former secretary of state, while others are heaping all the mistakes on his head and are trying to make him the scapegoat for miscalculations. The question is what will actually change in Washington's foreign policy after Haig's departure? Will there in fact be any changes?

[Demchenko] Well, in any case, such a turn is demanded by progressive American public opinion. It is demanded for instance, by Richard Bernard, an eminent public figure and director of the Political Research Institute, in a letter to the editor of the New York TIMES. The letter says: The fact that the government has scornfully dismissed the Soviet Union's statement that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons seems incredible. If the Soviet Union is making concessions in order to give an impression that it is a responsible, peace-loving country, this is propaganda of a kind which we must welcome and to which we should respond in kind.

[Ariyevich] The successfully concluded Soviet-French space flight is a clear demonstration of the readiness of the Soviet Union to develop relations with the West, and the fact that these relations can develop successfully. On that, we end our program and take leave of you. Goodbye, comrades, all the best.

LUNS URGES MILITARILY CAPAPABLE MERCHANT FLEETS

PM060841 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 82 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed "Rejoinder" from "The World Today" feature compiled by Yu. Romanov: "The Elder Tree Is in the Garden...."]

[Text] AFP has reported from Copenhagen that NATO Secretary General J. Luns, having discovered one more "Soviet threat" to the West, has called on the NATO countries "to build their new merchant ships in such a way that they can be easily refitted for military purposes."

In arguing his case Luns referred to the fact that Britain, in the course of the few weeks of the Falklands conflict, created a whole armada of ships refitted in record time from its merchant fleet. But what does that have to do with the "Soviet threat"? Here's what, Luns replies with the swagger of a magician drawing rabbits, umbrellas and other unlikely objects out of a battered top hat: "If the Soviet Union had undertaken a similar operation, the West would have been shaken and, moreover, demoralized."

The elder tree is in the garden, they say in such circumstances [idiom refers to non sequiturs]. But the NATO strategists do not scorn even these methods when fueling militarist hysteria. On the other hand, the military-industrial concerns are delighted at Luns's absurd logical constructions. After all, the implementation of his insane ideas promises them a new market for the sale of their dangerous output.

CONFERENCE ON ANTARCTICA OPENS IN LENINGRAD

LD051550 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 5 Jul 82

[Text] Leningrad July 6 TASS -- The international community of Antarctica's explorers have proved to the world the possibility and the broadest prospects of open cooperation between different countries in studying and developing an entire continent, Professor George Nox (New Zealand), president of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), declared in Leningrad today. He was speaking at the city's House of Scientists, where the international committee, grouping 15 countries engaged in the exploration of the "white continent", opened its 17th session.

The session, attended by some 100 scientists from leading research centres, will review implementation of joint programs and draw up recommendations regarding various aspects of the organisation of Antarctic expeditions.

Professor Nox greeted the delegations from the German Democratic Republic, Poland and West Germany, the committee's three newly-accepted members which are taking part in its session for the first time. Addressing observers from Brazil, Italy, China and the Netherlands, which had also expressed their wish to take part in studying the nature of the south polar continent, he emphasised that the door of the Antarctic scientific community is open to all.

Speaking at the opening of the session, Professor Boris Krutskikh, director of the Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute, expressed profound satisfaction on behalf of Soviet polar explorers that the gathering is taking place in Leningrad. He recalled that it is from the banks of the Neva River that the Russian sea-going expedition led by Faddei Bellingshauzen and Mikhail Lazarev, which discovered the Antartica, set out over 150 years ago. It is also from Leningrad that Soviet expeditions leave for the Antarctica by sea and by air every year.

Soviet scientists are convinced, Boris Krutskikh said, that it is only on a broad international basis that the study of global natural processes is possible for the good for all countries and peoples. He emphasised that Soviet polar explorers favour efforts to preserve the Antarctica, the accepted continent of peace and friendship, as the standard of nature unaffected by man and to prevent anthropogenic influence there as efficiently as possible.

The Leningrad session will last five days.

'CARDIAC EXPERTS' VISIT UZBEK SURGERY INSTITUTE

GF031921 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] The cardiac experts who attended an international congress in Moscow on treatment of cardiac diseases are currently visiting the Uzbek SSR. Representatives of cardiac centers in Britain, Switzerland, France and the FRG visited the Uzbek Research Institute of Surgery. During their tour of the institute they acquainted themselves with the work carried out by the institute's laboratories and department of cardiac surgery. They also acquainted themselves with the Uzbek's SSR's cardiological research institute.

It will be recalled that Uzbek experts held an advanced position in this field in the Soviet Union. They are achieving great success in surgical removal of human ailments that are congenital or develop after birth.

BREZHNEV SENDS FOURTH OF JULY CABLE TO REAGAN

LD031430 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has sent a telegram to U.S. President Ronald Reagan. "On the occasion of the U.S. national holiday, Independence Day," the telegram says, "please accept my congratulations and wishes for peace to the American people."

REAGAN POLICY CALLED 'DOCTRINE OF INTERFERENCE'

Zhukov in PRAVDA

PM021413 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 82 p 4

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Yuriy Zhukov: "A Doctrine of Interference"]

[Text] By declaring in a speech in London a "crusade" against communism, U.S. President Ronald Reagan formulated a kind of doctrine of interference in the internal affairs of states whose social systems are not to the current U.S. administration's liking. He tried to justify this design with hypocritical arguments about the United States, having arrogated to itself the right to throw its weight about all over the world, wanting to spread freedom everywhere. But then Reagan gave away the real point of his plan by offering as the model for the struggle for freedom the actions of the murderers who are hanging on to power in blood-soaked El Salvador solely as a result of U.S. military aid.

"Democracy is not a delicate flower. But it must be cultivated," the U.S. President said. By "cultivating" democracy and freedom he means direct interference in the affairs of other countries where the United States would like to set up its own system. "Although we must be careful," he continued, "on the question of forcing changes (he is talking, of course, about the changes the U.S. President would like to effect in countries he doesn't like -- Yu. Zhukov), we must unhesitatingly proclaim our ultimate goals and take concrete action to attain them."

Reviving an Old Design

None of this is new, of course. The U.S. President is basically going back to what Washington was contemplating in the late forties. Let us look back. In 1947, when the United States had a temporary monopoly on atomic weapons, Washington was bent on world supremacy.

Propagandizing this design, U.S. political scientist James Burnham, who aspired to the role of the State Department's spiritual mentor, published a book called "The Struggle for the World." It laid down tenets which, for example, Washington has not put into circulation again: "Peace cannot be the main aim of U.S. policy," "The destruction of mankind is preferable to the victory of communism".... But the conclusions reached by this "philosopher" are what is most interesting:

"1. It is necessary to admit that peace is not and cannot be foreign policy goal.
"2. It is necessary to abandon all remnants of the doctrine of the 'equality of nations.' The United States must openly aspire to world political leadership.
"3. It is necessary to completely abandon the principle of 'noninterference in other nations' internal affairs'.... The normal procedure for solving questions affecting world politics must be rapid, vigorous and adequate interference."

This doctrine of interference in others' affairs was fairly rapidly translated into concrete actions. In April 1948 the magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT printed an article entitled "Underground Tactics in Cold War." It laid down extensive plans for the organization of sabotage, espionage and terrorist activity in East European countries -- this was "Operation X" the idea for which was suggested by Senator Bridges in Congress 24 March 1948.

The article noted that Washington envisages "organizing armed detachments under U.S. leadership. The murder of prominent Communists will be encouraged. U.S. agents, parachuted in, will be used to coordinate anticommunist activity."

Two years later, in April 1950, the then U.S. President, Truman, approved secret Directive No 68, drawn up by the National Security Council, which declared as a priority aim the establishment of a world "order" acceptable to Washington.

To that end, the Truman directive prescribed, the United States must increase its might even more and deploy it in such a way as to "ensure a fundamental change in the nature of the Soviet system," "sow in the Soviet system the seeds of its destruction" and also "encourage and support disorder and rebellion in selected countries in strategically important locations which are neighbors of the Soviet Union."

Later, 10 October 1951, the U.S. Congress adopted a truly unprecedented law setting aside $100 million to pay "any people resident in the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Albania...or people who have fled these countries and who have been chosen (!) either to form subunits of armed forces supporting NATO or for other purposes."

About a year later, U.S. President Eisenhower addressed an American Legion meeting in New York 25 August 1952 and made a supplementary point: "Our administration must tell the Kremlin that we will never acknowledge to the slightest degree Russia's positions in East Europe and in Asia as permanent."

The years went by, U.S. presidents and their advisers changed and U.S. foreign policy followed a zigzag course. When the cold war against the USSR and our allies failed, the doctrine of interference was shelved temporarily, and the decade of relaxation of tension came in. But now we can see that Washington is breathing new life into the old doctrine of interference.

One would think that now, in the eighties, when the United States has lost its military superiority and a balance of forces has been established in the world between the two opposing political and social systems, it would be clear that adventurist plans for subversive activity against states which the U.S. imperialists do not like are doomed from the start. Nevertheless, more and more reports are coming in from Washington to the effect that the current U.S. administration wants to try again to "destabilize," as it is fashionable to say in Washington at the moment, the states it does not like, first and foremost the USSR.

What Are They Trying To Achieve?

The "new" (but essentially old and antiquated) U.S. strategy was proclaimed 21 May by W. Clark, the president's national security adviser and personal friend. Five days later the New York TIMES revealed that his speech had been based on a "national security memorandum" "secretly signed" by the U.S. President 1 week before Clark's speech.

On 27 May the Philadelphia INQUIRER added the following: "A senior official well acquainted with Reagan's eight-page directive admitted that its aim was massive pressure on the Soviet Union." "The new policy," the same person said, "is designed to gain an advantage through an active although cautious campaign the purpose of which is to bring about internal reforms (?) in the Soviet Union."

A further 3 days elapsed and the New York TIMES, continuing its obviously coordinated actions to inure U.S. public opinion to the resumption of the policy of "rolling back communism," reported yet another "unpublished document" -- this time comprising not 8 but 126 pages and providing a detailed account of "the Pentagon's new strategy" conceived "for the coming decade."

"One of the main aspects" of this memorandum, wrote the paper's military observer, R. Halloran, is the "special operations," "subversion and methods of psychological warfare," which "must be refined." He added that the term "special operations" means "subversive actions, sabotage and psychological warfare."

On 20 June Washington POST military observer G. Wilson announced that the implementation of "special operations" was being transferred to the level of practical actions.

Citing informed sources, he reported: "The Reagan administration has directed the military apparatus to 'revive and activate' special forces for actions beyond the frontline, inside the Warsaw Pact countries, in the event of war. The backbone of these forces will be made up of army subunits which are undergoing training in the languages of the Warsaw Pact countries and are working on sabotage tactics involving the blowing up of railroads and command centers."

As for "psychological war," Washington has already been waging it for many months, using the full force of the U.S. propaganda and intelligence apparatus, especially via the radio and also with the help of political contraband methods.

Ideological Intervention

A point about the "psychological warfare." Another New York TIMES observer, B. Gwertzman, writing the day after R. Halloran's article was published -- that is, on 1 June -- revealed the content of this formula. He reported that Washington was "drawing up" a "quasigovernmental" program designed to "help strengthen democracy in the developing countries and, where possible, in the communist countries."

In his speech in London the U.S. President confirmed that such a program was actually being drawn up by the "chairman and other leaders of the Republican and Democratic Party national organizations together with the bipartisan American Political Foundation." "I eagerly await their recommendations and look forward to working with these organizations and with Congress," Reagan said. "It is time we, as a country — I mean the state and private sectors — pledged to aid the development of democracy."

The reader, scanning the innumerable columns of the fat New York TIMES, might have missed this report, and if he had noticed it he would not have been alarmed: What is bad about the idea of "helping strengthen democracy"? One thing is odd, though: Why does the United States want to aid the development of democracy in other countries but not at home where there is not even a whiff of genuine democracy? But let us read more of what B. Gwertzman has written. Apparently we are talking about... "open financing (that is, bribery -- Yu. Zhukov) of political parties, trade unions and newspapers" in countries whose regimes the United States does not like.

Maybe this is the first time the U.S. administration has been so open about preparations for ideological intervention abroad. "We don't mind handing over millions of dollars in guns and butter," said -- according to the New York TIMES observer -- "a senior representative," "so why should we be ashamed about granting aid to support democratic forces, too?"

As for the term "democratic forces," which is used to deceive the eye, it fools no one. Everyone knows that in reality the millions of dollars are going not to democratic forces, which, incidentally, would never accept this dirty money, but to the most diehard reactionaries. It is no accident, for example, that the Indian paper NATIONAL HERALD called this new U.S. plan direct interference in the developing countries' internal affairs.

There is another aspect of the U.S. doctrine of interference, made public the other day in the United States, which puts all honest people dedicated to the cause of peace on their guard: Washington has started talking publicly about plans for using U.S. Armed Forces on other people's territory without their consent.

"As the (U.S. administration) document notes, the strategy for southwest Asia, including the Persian Gulf," the New York TIMES wrote 31 May, "instructs U.S. (military) forces to be ready, if necessary, on their own initiative (!) to occupy positions in that region without waiting for an invitation from a friendly government."

Everyone will recall that the Final Act of the Helsinki conference, in which the participating states pledged to refrain from any interference in one another's internal affairs, bore the U.S. President's signature. But what is it worth in the light of the newly proclaimed doctrine of interference in the affairs of any state which the United States finds disagreeable?

Comparison of Bolshakov Article

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 26 June carries on page 5, under the rubric "Commentator's Column" and entitled "Washington's 'Crusaders,'" the text of an article by Vladimir Bolshakov that was previously reported by TASS English and published in the 28 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page A 6. The following amendments to the TASS item will provide the PRAVDA text:

The PRAVDA item begins: An unusual ceremony has taken place in Langley, not far from Washington, at the headquarters of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, which was once dubbed "the Department of Dirty Tricks" by the New York TIMES. President Reagan came here, accompanied by prominent senators and congressmen, to sign a new bill safeguarding the "rights" of professional spies, terrorists and saboteurs.

The CIA and other U.S. intelligence departments, which the new bill -- which became law after the Langley ceremony -- gives immunity from... (supplying PRAVDA opening, picking up first paragraph, line two)

First paragraph, penultimate line reads in PRAVDA: ...the interests of the U.S. monopolies.

"Covert operations" is a professional term used by masters of dirty tricks from the CIA meaning espionage, acts of terrorism, paramilitary operations, sabotage and political assassinations.

Over its history... (omitting "Vladimir Bolshakov writes in PRAVDA today," supplying additional passage)

Second paragraph, penultimate line reads in PRAVDA: ...most disgusting crimes of U.S. imperialism. (omitting "the commentary stresses")

Third paragraph, from line five to the end of paragraph, PRAVDA reads: ... instructing Afghan counterrevolutionaries. Their hands are stained with the blood of Patrice Lumumba, Salvador Orlando Letelier and hundreds of thousands of patriots who have been tortured in the jails of pro-American juntas. (omitting "says the commentary in PRAVDA" and (rewording, omitting "to death")

SPECULATION ON HAIG RESIGNATION EXAMINED

Return to Obstruction

LD041034 Moscow in English to North America 0300 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Talk by Valentin Zorin, political observer for Soviet television and radio, in "Moscow Viewpoint" program]

[Text] Today I would like to turn to one particular event that has aroused a lot of speculations during the past few days. I have in mind the resignation of Alexander Haig from his post of the United States secretary of state. Unexpected as it was, this resignation raises again the problem of stability or rather of instability of United States foreign policy, something which certainly causes problems in dealings with the present United States administration. I do not think I will tell you anything new if I say like a host of other observers of the international scene that the present United States administration is really unpredictable in its moves and decisions. The very sudden resignation of Alexander Haig offers just one more proof of this general fact. It happened so that I was able to see Haig at the time when the White House was obviously deciding on his resignation.

Being in New York on June 18th and 19th I attended Haig's meetings with the Soviet foreign minister, Andrey Gromyko. The secretary of state looked his confident best and I can bet my last dollar, as the saying goes, he had no premonitions of what the fates had in store for him.

Having said all that, I don't want my listeners to get the impression that people here in Moscow have any special sympathy for the former secretary of state and lament his departure from the Washington scene. People here have not forgotten that it was Haig who said soon after taking the post of United States foreign policy leader, what there are things that are more important than peace. And it is certainly anybody's guess that Mr Haig's successor will do and whether he will introduce corrections into Washington's foreign policy which has so far been anything but constructive. Mr Haig's retirement also proves that the present United States administration, which is approaching the end of its term, has been unable to work out some consistent foreign policy in all this time.

Take ths fact for example: During President Reagan's recent tour of Europe it was not only in Moscow but in more than one West European capital that people got the impression that Washington is going after all to take into account political realities, that it would drop its attempts to obstruct economic relations between West European countries and the Soviet Union. And now American observers point out that one of the reasons for Haig's resignation was a change in the White House stand on this issue and a return to some absolutely unrealistic attempts to obstruct normal economic links between Western Europe and the Soviet Union.

Many American observers point out that this decision does probably more harm not to the Soviet Union but to Washington's relations with its West European allies, and I for one think that there is much truth in what they say. But the really important thing is that the United States leaders have demonstrated once again to the whole world that one can't really rely on United States commitments even if they are assumed at the highest level.

Washington apparently thinks nothing of changing its mind and going back on its own obligations. There seems to be no end to its contradictory statements and I simply cannot recall one other United States administration in all of the postwar years that (?would) be as inconsistent, as unreliable in its commitments and which would go in for such dizzy, hairpin turns in its foreign policy. One of the fundamentals of international law rests on the principle of continuity, which means that a new government of a nation considers itself fully bound by treaties and commitments concluded by their (?predecessors). The Reagan administration, however, has been demonstrating and continues to demonstrate its full disregard of these basic norms of international law. It not only ignores treaties signed by the previous occupants of the White House but does not hesitate to go back in its own word. One striking example to this effect is the sudden resignation of Alexander Haig and many American observers are asking already whether the United States delegation to the Soviet-American talks in Geneva would stick to the stand worked out under Alexander Haig or whether many more months would be lost while the new State Department head gets his bearings.

Of course it is up to the elected leaders of the nation to decide who should stand at the head of United States foreign policy. But having a clearcut and consistent foreign policy is not just an internal matter but an indispensible condition for solving vital international problems, which permit no delays or ambiguities.

Foreign Policy Crisis

LD021348 Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Commentary by Radio Moscow correspondent Spartak Alekseyev in New York]

[Text] Explaining the reasons for his resignation, Alexander Haig said that in the past few months it has become clear to him that the foreign policy of the United States has (?parted) from the cautious course which was worked out when the present administration stepped into office. Newspaper commentators give other possible reasons that have led to an open split in the government.

First of all they point to the U.S. policy in the Middle East where America's ally Israel (?started) a new aggression. There was also the U.S. support of another aggressor, Great Britain, during the military conflict in the South Atlantic, and also the decision of Washington to toughen sanctions against companies supplying equipment for the gas pipeline linking the Soviet Union with West Europe. Speaking about more minor reasons, news analysts point to the rivalry between Haig on the one hand and National Security Adviser Clark and Defense Secretary Weinberger on the other.

However the roots of the crisis are much deeper, and the problem is not in who is more moderate and more tough in the administration. The point is that the foreign policy of the United States failed to win popularity even among its NATO allies with the exception, perhaps, of Britain's Prime Minister Mrs Thatcher. And that policy is even less popular in the United States itself. The arms race policy has frightened millions of so-called silent Americans and to such an extent that they have raised their voices against that policy. There have been hundreds of peace marches in many cities. There was also the unprecedented 1-million strong antiwar manifestation in New York. (?It was timed) with the opening of the special disarmament session of the United Nations General Assembly. What is more the marchers demanded that the policy of building up arms and military confrontation be put to a referendum in connection with the coming elections to Congress in November.

So Haig's resignation is not just the personal drama of a former general who failed to make a career of a diplomat; nor is it a family scandal in the Reagan administration. It is the crisis of a policy which does not assess realistically the balance of forces in the world, a policy based on military intimidation and military superiority.

REAGAN ASKS POPE TO ACT ON POLAND, ANTIWAR CLERGY

WA021130 Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 21 Jun 82 p 1

[Unattributed TASS article "On the Meeting in the Vatican" published "in full" in PRAVDA 19 June]

[Text] Paris, June 18 -- Certain details of the recent meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Pope John Paul II in the Vatican have become public here. Specifically, the President insistently urged the head of the Roman Catholic Church to take a tougher stand regarding Poland and to intensify pressure on the leadership of the country, using for this purpose the clergy and their contacts with various anti-government organisations. Reagan recommended Pope John Paul II to visit Poland in August 1982 under the pretext of attending religious functions and take up officially the question of the visit with the Polish authorities, despite an obvious fact that the plans of the visit will be difficult to realize in the near future.

According to the same reliable information, Ronald Reagan expressed readiness to step up financial aid to the opposition circles in Poland, specifically, through church channels. The U.S. President also asked Pope John Paul II to exert moderating influence on the Roman Catholic priests who were taking part in anti-war movements in the West.

KICHIGIN ON U.S.-PRC ESPIONAGE COOPERATION

PM300951 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 82 p 3

[Capt S. Kichigin article: "For Subversive Purposes; On Cooperation Between U.S. and Chinese Special Services"]

[Text] On one of his first trips to Beijing in 1971, former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger gave the "Chinese friends" a photograph. The transatlantic visitor's present caused wild delight in Beijing. The fact is that to commemorate his visit, Kissinger, as the foreign press reported, handed over a photograph of USSR military installations in the vicinity of the Soviet-Chinese border....The years which have elapsed since that meeting have been marked by a mutual desire on the part of China and the United States to intensively develop cooperation between their intelligence services. The scale of their current joint subversive activity against the USSR, the socialist community countries and young independent states is so considerable that the partners can no longer manage to conceal it from the international public.

The U.S. and PRC intelligence departments cooperate in the most diverse spheres. There is electronic espionage against the USSR and other countries, the training of agents and their infiltration into Afghanistan, the exchange of espionage information, the exchange of experience of subversive work, and ideological sabotage.

The foreign press has already reported the creation, by the U.S. and PRC special services, of radioelectronic espionage stations on Chinese territory in Xianjiang near the Soviet-Chinese border directed against the USSR. Now the details have become known.

The main task of the stations is to gather information on the launching in the USSR of space systems and rockets. According to the U.S. magazine COVERT ACTION, the U.S. National Security Agency sent a group of employees on a mission to the PRC to train the Chinese in the handling of the electronic espionage apparatus. The technical equipment of these stations, mainly of U.S. manufacture, is more efficient than that which was used by the CIA in Iran until the overthrow of the Shah's regime.

It must be supposed that such cooperation is to the taste of the partners, especially Beijing, which, given the well-known scientific and technical backwardness of the country, as yet does not possess highly efficient modern means for espionage and subversive work. Cooperation with the CIA helps Beijing to make good this "deficiency." With U.S. help it is planned to create new espionage centers in the PRC. The "Karakorum" project has become known. The Karakorum mountain range which lies close to China's border with the USSR, India and Afghanistan, has been chosen for creating radio espionage stations directed against these countries. This time, besides the CIA and the Chinese intelligence service, British "geologists" and Pakistani representatives will also be participating in the operation. The latter mainly need information about India and Afghanistan and they hope to obtain it. Their hopes are not without foundation. In the opinion of the Washington and Beijing intelligence service leaders, Ziaul Haq's antipopular regime in Islamabad has fully "earned the right" to this, since it has unreservedly made available its country's territory for subversive activity against the DRA.

The work to implement this project has already begun. In September 1980 an expedition composed of 70 Americans, Chinese, British, and Pakistani specialists, undertook a search in the Karakorum mountains for fixed sites where radar installations and also computers, designed to process the information obtained could be set up.

But espionage stations on the ground are by no means the whole story. Cooperation between the U.S. and Chinese special services is now being planned on a cosmic scale. According to reports in the foreign press, the United States has decided to sell China a station for receiving and decoding information from Landsat-D satellites.

These spy satellites can be used to gather information for military purposes. What is more, the United States has proposed that the PRC purchase from them a suitable satellite and, as the magazine FLIGHT INTERNATIONAL reports, put it into the "necessary" orbit by means of a U.S. carrier rocket from a U.S. astrodrome.

Of course, in taking the step of giving "assistance" to Chinese intelligence, the White House is counting on the fact that Beijing will not remain indebted and will not let them down. And Beijing is justifying the White House's hopes. After the victory of the anti-imperialist revolution in Iran, documents were discovered in the archives, which showed how far Beijing may go in its alliance with the CIA. It became obvious that, while passing itself off as a "sincere friend" of the Arab peoples and while establishing extensive contacts with their leaders, China was pursuing the goal of gathering as detailed information as possible about the economic and military potential of the Arab states of the Near East and also about their long-term plans for struggle against Zionism and imperialism. Later, during routine talks between the Maoist leaders and their Western partners, this information was passed on to representatives of the U.S. special services for drawing up Washington's strategic course in the Near East, and then conveyed via the CIA to Israeli intelligence.

Beijing is flinging the doors open still wider to the CIA. In various regions of the PRC it is planned to create relay transmitters for VOA and other subversive radio stations. Here, it is a question not just of government radio stations of the United States itself, but of the subversive antisocialist radio intelligence centers -- Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe -- which are financed by the White House and operate under CIA control. The bosses of these centers -- CIA staffers -- are deciding on the question of sending their "correspondents" to China.

The "Voice of Democratic Kampuchea" radio station, which is already operating from Chinese territory, is a prototype for future cooperation between PRC and U.S. subversive broadcasting centers. Though its work is directed by Chinese intelligence employees, they receive their instructions from Washington.

The Reagan administration's arrival in the White House marked the start of a new stage in cooperation between the U.S. and Chinese espionage departments. Even during his election campaign, Reagan repeatedly declared that if he were elected he would take the most energetic measures to improve the efficiency of the "work" of the intelligence services. And while many of his other election promises, primarily in the social sphere, have not been fulfilled, he is keeping his word with regard to intensifying the CIA's subversive espionage activity.

To this end, in the planned galvanization of U.S. intelligence, a major place is allotted to strengthening its cooperation with the intelligence services of countries allied to the United States, among which China is striving to be numbered. It is precisely this which gave rise to the permanent participation, in U.S.-Chinese talks, of representatives of the U.S. and PRC intelligence services. Thus, in the summer of 1981, as part of the delegation led by U.S. Secretary of State A. Haig, Lt Gen (retired) Vernon Walters -- former deputy CIA director and now, under the Reagan administration, a special envoy -- visited Beijing. It is not difficult to guess that the "special" nature of this "diplomat's" activity includes the development of contacts between the CIA and the Chinese special services. And this explains the fact that Zhang Zhunci [name as published], deputy chief of PRC army intelligence, attended the talks on the Chinese side. As was stated, there was a "fruitful exchange of views" during the meeting.

The subject matter of this "exchange" is constantly expanding. Recently this has not just been information on the military and economic potential of various countries, but also information on organizations and individual figures in the international revolutionary movement. According to data of the Chilean resistance's organ REBELDE, Pinochet received from the PRC Embassy in Santiago lists of leftwing organizations and figures waging the struggle against the fascist junta, and facts about their activity. The Beijing and Washington experts are carrying out joint subversive work on the African continent too.

The cooperation between the Chinese and U.S. intelligence services is an important element in the whole system of their military-political ties. It is expanding and becoming increasingly dangerous as the linkup between Beijing hegemonism and U.S. imperialism becomes increasingly close.

PRAVDA REPORTS EXPULSION OF CHINESE FROM MPR

PM010841 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 82 p 6

[TASS report: "Expelled From Mongolia"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 22 Jun — By a decision of the competent organs, a group of citizens of Chinese nationality living in Ulaanbaatar has been expelled from Mongolia.

As the MONTSAME agency reports, these people have engaged in criminal activity, have violated socialist legality and have been living on unearned income.

The newspaper (ULANBATORYN MEDE) draws attention to the fact that a significant proportion of the Chinese people living in Mongolia who are capable of work are doing their utmost to avoid socially useful labor and are engaging illegally in private enterprise and speculation. The aforementioned actions radically contravene the policy of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and the Mongolian People's State, the newspaper stresses.

BARAKHTA ON RICHARD ALLEN'S VISIT TO TAIWAN

LD030730 Moscow TASS in English 0645 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow Jul 3 TASS — The recent statements of officials of the United States show that the Reagan administration continues the course of using both Taiwan and China in their imperialist interests, Boris Barakhta writes in PRAVDA in connection with the official visit to Taiwan by Richard Allen, former assistant to the President for national security affairs and now senior adviser of the Republican Party's National Committee on Questions of Foreign Policy and National Security.

According to Allen, the relations between Washington and Taipei after the appointment of George Shultz as new U.S. secretary of state will be strengthening, the commentary runs. The American newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR notes in this connection that George Shultz's predecessor Alexander Haig went too far in his concessions to Beijing, forgetting President Reagan's long sympathies for the puppet regime in Taiwan. The overseas press recalls that George Shultz was in the leadership of the Bechtel Corporation which maintains links in construction of atomic electric power stations with the Taiwan company Chan Sin Engineering. Richard Allen's Taiwan voyage shows once again that the U.S. administration does not think of giving up the "policy of two Chinas". Recognition of such a policy of the United States is the price which is demanded by Washington, which plays a double game, from Beijing for consolidation of military-strategic partnership between Chinese hegemonism and American imperialism.

IZVESTIYA HITS SUZUKI CLAIMS TO KURIL ISLANDS

PM051345 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 82 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by V. Krotov: "Following an Unseemly Course"]

[Text] The Japanese authorities and the ruling Liberal Democratic Party have long intended to promote shameless anti-Sovietism to the rank of state policy and essentially consider the USSR their "main potential enemy." The decision to institute a so-called Northern Territories Day (northern territories in the language of these forces is the name for the islands of the Lesser Kuril chain belonging to the Soviet Union -- V.K.) was the latest step in the implementation of this course that circles of a militarist bent and forces close to them both in Japan and in the United States have begun to impose.

Japanese Prime Minister Z. Suzuki himself has frequently made territorial claims against the USSR. Indicative in this respect is the interview the prime minister gave to the West German journal DER SPIEGEL, in which he repeated the same attacks but, as observers note, counted on "a broad international response." Attention is also attracted by the fact that Z. Suzuki is actually making the further development of Japanese-Soviet relations in various spheres dependent on the solution of this "question."

Let us begin with the fact that those who, playing on nationalist sentiments, advance unfounded claims to Soviet territories are very well aware that this conceals their desire to revise the results of World War II, which have been enshrined in international documents and recognized by all previous Japanese governments. Besides, over 5 years ago, in May 1977, Z. Suzuki himself, as minister of agriculture and forestry, signed on behalf of the Japanese Government a Soviet-Japanese agreement on fishing in the northwest Pacific in which the Japanese side's recognizes that the southern part of the Kurils belongs to the Soviet Union. In particular the first article of this agreement states that its aim is to establish the procedure and conditions for fishing by Japanese citizens in regions "defined in accordance with article 6 of the USSR Supreme Soviet decree of 10 December 1976 'On Temporary Measures To Preserve Live Fish Resources and Regulate Fishing in the Maritime Regions Adjacent to the USSR Seaboard.'" A USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the same question defined absolutely precisely the borders of the region of the southern group of Kuril Islands. No one, not even the most reactionary mass media organs, would venture to say that all this is unknown to the Japanese prime minister.

What, we ask, has prompted the prime minister to raise this "question"? I think this is best explained by the reports that have filtered through to the press concerning the so-called Z. Suzuki memorandum, in which the prime minister sets short- and long-term goals for the Japanese Government under cover of the myth of the "Soviet threat." The memorandum does not just reiterate the territorial claims against the USSR but calls for the seizure of the "northern territories." As for further plans, the document contains instructions to act, by the end of the century, against Japan's rivals in South and Southeast Asia -- India and China -- to secure economic and political influence in these regions, particularly in the ASEAN countries.

In the opinion of observers, anti-Sovietism is also necessary to the Japanese Government from a tactical viewpoint. On this wavelength Tokyo wants to resolve a number of the acute problems facing the country in the international arena, particularly in its relations with its closest ally -- the United States. It is well known that Japanese-U.S. relations have for many years been overshadowed by grave disputes in the economic and trade sphere. The U.S. deficit in trade with Japan became chronic long ago. The Japanese authorities are reluctantly embarking on concessions to Washington's demands that radical steps be taken to reduce this deficit. As in the past, Tokyo is trying to compensate for its unyielding stance with a show of adherence to Washington's anti-Soviet course and NATO's line of confrontation with the USSR.

This was the key to Suzuki's interview with DER SPIEGEL. It shows once again that the forces that have set themselves the unseemly goal of deadlocking Japanese-Soviet relations and turning the country into a camp overtly hostile to the USSR are continuing to gain the upper hand in Japan. This approach toward relations with its neighbor fails to accord above all with Japan's national interests and contradicts the cause of peace and security in the Far East and Asia.

IZVESTIYA CRITICIZES U.S. POLICY IN S. KOREA

PM051455 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 82 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by S. Agafonov: "Solidarity With the Korean People"]

[Text] The 32d anniversary of the start of the aggressive war unleashed on the Korean peninsula by the forces of the South Korean military supported by U.S. imperialism falls on 25 June. The result of this war was the United States' de facto occupation of South Korea and the establishment of the antidemocratic regime in Seoul.

The traditional month -- now beginning -- of solidarity with the Korean people's struggle for the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea and for the country's unification on a peaceful, democratic basis is a specific manifestation of the broad support by all progressive forces of the world for these just demands, and this support was confirmed, in particular, in the resolution of the 30th session of the UN General Assembly calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea. The DPRK's policy is consistently aimed at creating favorable conditions for the country's peaceful unification on a democratic basis. That is convincingly borne out by the constructive proposals for settling the situation on the Korean peninsula which the DPRK Government has frequently proposed.

The policy of Washington and Seoul contrasts sharply with this peace-loving course. Over the past years South Korea's territory has been turned into a stronghold for U.S. militarism in the Far East. A 40,000-strong U.S. expeditionary corps is based here, equipped not only with conventional armaments but also with nuclear weapons.

The buildup of the U.S. military presence in South Korea, which contradicts the UN decision, is a long-term U.S. policy in the Far East. Militarist partnership is the basis of the mutual relations between the United States and the Seoul regime. That is not surprising, since U.S. interests in South Korea are backed up by a 600,000-strong puppet army created with the Pentagon's most active participation. It is precisely in South Korea's further militarization that Washington sees a guarantee of the consolidation of its own influence on the Korean peninsula and in the Far East as a whole.

It must be noted that this course contradicts the interests of the Korean people and is in fact leading to South Korea's enslavement. Acting to the advantage of its overseas patron, Seoul most cruelly suppresses any dissent and resorts to bloody repressions against people inconvenient to the regime.

Washington is trying to justify the buildup of its military presence in South Korea by references to the "threat" that allegedly emanates from North Korea and to present the de facto occupation of the southern part of the Korean peninsula as some sort of "stabilizing factor" in the region. However, the facts prove the contrary. The accelerated military building and constant large-scale maneuvers that are being carried out in the immediate vicinity of the DPRK's borders, the violation of its airspace, border provocations, acts of subversion and psychological warfare -- that is what the "peacemaking" of Washington and Seoul is becoming.

The actions are generating angry condemnation from broad circles of the world public. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and all people of good will voice their unanimous support for the Korean people's just struggle for the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea and the country's unification on a peaceful, democratic basis.

MAURITIUS DEMANDS RETURN OF DIEGO GARCIA

FM051029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 82 p 5

[Correspondent V. Shirokov dispatch: "Just Demand"]

[Text] Delhi, 25 Jun -- The new government which came to power as a result of the victory of the bloc of leftwing parties in the Mauritian elections has issued a demand for the return to the country of the island of Diego Garcia, which was seized by Britain. In a statement about this the country's new prime minister, Aneerood Jugnauth, said that his government is categorically against the use of Diego Garcia island, which is an inseparable part of the territory of the state of Mauritius, as a U.S. military base.

We will do everything possible to restore our national sovereignty over Diego Garcia island, the prime minister said. The Indian Ocean must be demilitarized and turned into a zone of peace in accordance with the UN declaration.

USTINOV RECEIVES INDIAN DEFENSE OFFICIAL

LD031722 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1656 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow, 3 Jul (TASS) -- Marshal Dmitriy Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, has received General Krishna Rao, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and chief of the Army Staff of the Republic of India, who is in the USSR on an official visit.

Dmitriy Ustinov and Krishna Rao held a friendly conversations during which questions of mutual interest were discussed. Nikolay Ogarkov, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff, USSR first deputy minister of defense and marshal of the Soviet Union, and USSR deputy ministers of defense took part in the conversation.

INDIA'S RAO CITED ON RELATIONS WITH USSR

LD032232 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] New Delhi July 3 TASS -- Indian Foreign Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao spoke highly of the state of Indian-Soviet relations.

Relations between India and the Soviet Union have demonstrated their durability and mutually beneficial character for several decades now, he said in an interview with the Hong Kong weekly FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW. The Soviet Union has assisted India in strengthening its industry and the economy at a time when few other countries were ready to share their technological know-how with us. The Soviet Union continues demonstrating understanding and respect for the most important aspects of our foreign policy. India is a non-aligned country and declares for national freedom, peace and independence. In this connection P.V. Narasimha Rao said, it is apt to recall the pronouncements by our Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, who repeatedly stressed that it is precisely the Soviet Union which has always supported the stand of India at various international forums.

In the course of the interview the minister also touched upon India's relations with Pakistan. He said among other things that India sincerely wishes for an all-round improvement of relations between the two countries. With this aim in view, P.V. Narasimha Rao noted, (?we) have already launched a number of initiatives. Thus during the visit of the Pakistani foreign minister to Delhi last January we exchanged views as regards mutual nonaggression guarantees and also agreed to set up a joint commission. Deplorably, the atmosphere for continuing the dialogue has been spoiled by certain statements and moves of the Pakistani Government.

P.V. Narasimha Rao emphasized India's concern about the massive American weapons shipments to Pakistan. Like any other sovereign state, Pakistan has the right to purchase weapons for self-defence.

But when Pakistan starts purchasing sophisticated weapons on a large scale, this becomes a source of well-founded concern for India. The sorry experience of the past three decades is proof that our concern about the massive American weapons supplies to Pakistan is well-founded.

U.S. ENCOURAGING INDIAN SEPARATIST MOVEMENT

LD021748 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English to Asia 1300 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Text] The United States' ambassador in India, Harry Barnes, was asked a question at one of his latest press conferences concerning the United States involvement in the activities of the separatist forces in India. The question apparently placed Barnes in a difficult situation. Having many years experience in dealing with various audiences, still this time the ambassador could not find a reasonable answer. Barnes awkwardly tried to dodge the answers, speaking about the Americans' respect towards India's integrity and unity and about their common adherence to democracy. Even if Barnes revealed more resourcefulness, he would not have been able to disperse the alarm of the Indians, which is based on facts -- on the United States' concrete actions in relation to India -- and not on that image which the United States ambassador wished to create in the public opinion of that country.

Let's view some of these facts. Irrespective of India's protests, which Mr Barnes had to bring to Washington's notice, the United States provided shelter to the leader of the Sikh separatists, (Jagjit Singh Chowhan), and, irrespective of the Americans' allegations, this functionary is far from limiting himself to the status of a private person. He even established the so-called government of the state of Khalistan with the active assistance of the United States' special services, and first of all of the Central Intelligence Agency -- a state which the imperialists and separatists wish to establish on the basis of the state of Punjab. There is no state, but the (Chowhan) government already has large stockpiles of weapons, and again it was not without the support of the American authorities that the separatists from the Sikh emigrant groups opened up consulates of this non-existent state in New York, London, Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Amsterdam and in Frankfurt on the Main for popularizing the idea of establishing Khalistan.

However, the matter is not limited to only this. Thousands of passports of Khalistan, stacks of banknotes -- the Khalistan dollars -- have been printed in the United States. (Jagjit Singh Chowhan) and his so-called government are far from the only organization working against independent united India from the Potomac and the East River Banks. The Americans have warmed another rabid separatist, Ganga Singh Dhillon, and assisted in knotting together around him also the coordinating center. His functions include rendering financial aid to separatist elements in India. A number of emigrant Sikh groups in the United States intend to again apply to the United States [as heard] with the demand to admit the state of Khalistan to this international organization for the moral and political support of the likeminded people on Indian land.

In other words, attempts are made to ensure international recognition and legalization of the subversive activities of the separatists against India, to consolidate the forces of foreign and home reaction, with the active assistance of the American authorities and in collaboration with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. And it is quite natural that the prominent political figures of the Indian Republic are outrightly declaring that the recent boosting of the activities of various separatist and nationalistic elements in the country is linked with the activities of the United States' imperialist circles. Washington is encouraging in every way and backing these forces because it hopes to destabilize the situation in India with their assistance and thus render direct pressure on its home and foreign policies. Those who claim that they respect India's integrity and sovereignty in fact dream to extend their sphere of vital interests there.

COMMENTARY ON SIMLA AGREEMENT ANNIVERSARY

BK0221516 Moscow in Hindi to India 1400 GMT 1 Jul 82

[Ivan Lagrov commentary]

[Text] Ten years ago the Indian prime minister and the Pakistan president signed an agreement reached following negotiations at Simla. This agreement, which was ratified by the parliaments of both countries, brought about important changes in the development of international relations in South Asia. The Simla Agreement ended rivalry between India and Pakistan and provided a lasting base for the development of relations of good neighborliness and cooperation between them. The leaders of both countries decided in Simla to solve all controversial issues through direct political negotiations, to avoid the use of military force and outside interference in their relations.

This political document conformed to the basic interests of the people of India and Pakistan. Everybody knew that the earlier policy of rivalry with India as imposed by Pakistan's military (?leadership) only served the interest of the imperialists and hegemonists in this region. The countries of South Asia suffered greatly from this policy and the confrontations caused by it. A new policy had to govern India-Pakistan relations -- and that is what was done in Simla.

The Indian prime minister, Mrs Indira Gandhi, told a PTI correspondent in an interview that the agreement signed in Simla should in fact be considered as a nonaggression treaty. The path of dialogue and good neighborliness adopted by India and Pakistan 10 years ago has proved to be the only correct way leading to the normalization of the situation in the Indian Subcontinent. Through the Simla Agreement the Indian Government and the Bhutto civilian government in Pakistan arrived through negotiations at mutually acceptable solutions to many issues created by the 1971 war. The most significant thing was that trade, economic, cultural and other relations were reestablished between India and Pakistan. Nobody doubted the benefits of cooperation between the neighboring countries, and the new climate created in their relations greatly reduced the possibility of outside interference in the affairs of South Asian countries.

It is regrettable that the process of normalization in this region was disrupted at the end of the last decade. This was caused by the influence of external elements which the Simla Agreement tried to eliminate. In 1977, the military authorities assumed power in Pakistan, leading to increased conspiracies by the United States and China in South Asia. This was clearly refected in the militarization of Pakistan by the United States and China. These two countries are giving military aid worth more than $5 billion to Pakistan. Indian official circles have said that the supply of modern weapons on an unprecedented scale to Pakistan has disrupted the balance of power in this region.

The arming of Pakistan has constituted part of U.S. and PRC military preparations in the region. The United States considers Pakistan a good base for stationing its Rapid Deployment Force which was created with the aim of armed intervention in southwest Asia. On the other hand, China is gradually increasing its military presence in the Pakistan-occupied Kashmir area. The Simla Agreement received a setback due to increased activities by imperialists and hegemonists and their infulence on the policy of the Pakistan Government.

Pakistani representatives have also raised the Kashmir issue at various international conferences, while the Simla Agreement permits only India and Pakistan to solve this issue. The Pakistan authorities are trying unilaterally to change the real status of Gilgit, Skardu and Hunza areas of Kashmir which is in violation of the Simla Agreement.

The policy of the two parties with regard to the issues of normalization in the Indian Subcontinent can be assessed from their outlook toward the substance and spirit of the Simla Agreement. India strictly observes the Simla Agreement and has put forward new proposals with the aim of improving relations with Pakistan.

Last January, Indian Prime Minister Mrs Indira Gandhi proposed concluding a treaty of friendship and peace with Pakistan. With the same aim in view, India proposed setting up a joint economic commission which was accepted by Pakistan. India's far-reaching constructive proposals are based on the basic principles of the Simla Agreement. The agreement signed by India and Pakistan 10 years ago still continues to be an instrument of good neighborliness with the only condition being that both sides implement its provision.

U.S. AID FINANCES CONTINUING 'WAR' AGAINST DRA

PM021041 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 82 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Akhmedzyanov article: "Crimes Paid for by the United States"]

[Text] Afghanistan's friends are gladdened by the reports of the great creative work that the PDPA and the DRA Government are carrying out to strengthen political stability in the country and to restructure and organize the economy. But standing in the way of liberation from the age-old legacy of feudalism are the dark forces of domestic counterrevolution -- yesterday's landowners and usurers -- and their external patrons: American imperialism, the Beijing hegemonists, General Ziaul Haq's regime in Pakistan -- which they pay for -- and the reactionary regimes of certain Arab countries.

Pursuing their own military-political aims and being supremely indifferent to the fate of the Afghan people, these forces are supporting and encouraging counterrevolution on the hypocritical pretext of helping so-called "freedom fighters" and are waging an undeclared war against the DRA. Washington, Beijing and Riyadh must know that their proteges are murderers, robbers and rapists, but they are turning a blind eye to the fact.

With the vigorous support of patriotic young people, villagers and nomads, the DRA Armed Forces, the people's militia and the security organs have long since smashed many large basmak detachments. New reports that entire counties have been entirely cleared of basmak gangs are being received increasingly often. But the enemies of the Afghan Revolution are continuing to send in new groups of cutthroats from abroad, where dozens of "hornets' nests" -- camps for the training of counterrevolutionaries and saboteurs -- have been set up. They are incapable of changing the path chosen by the Afghan people. But under cover of darkness these bandits are terrorizing the population of remote villages, settling scores with local activists, stealing food and livestock from the peasants and raping.

How come this is still possible? Because Western imperialist forces and their accomplices are financing the criminals and putting the weapons into their hands. And if blood is being shed in Afghanistan today, it is primarily those who are paying for the killing who are to blame for this, along with the domestic reactionary forces.

The atrocities of the dushmans.... There is truly no limit to the brutality of these degenerates who are generously paid in American dollars. In the village of (Dzhava), Vardak Province, a group of basmaks from the Hezb-e Eslami-e Afghanistan gang burst into the home of the peasant (Abdula Sattar) and killed him for "failing to respect religion", and then, before the eyes of his children, raped their mother. While posing as champions of Islam, the bandits at the same time do not hesitate to murder clergymen. Thus back in the spring they murdered Shaykh (Ali Khoseyni), member of the Council for Islamic Affairs, and a few days later murdered the mullah of the (Khazrat-e Ibragim Khalil) mosque. In both cases the victims' crime was that the mullahs had condemned the bandits' actions as "incompatible with Islam."

People in America and West Europe like to talk about human rights and defending those rights, but not when it comes to people who are fighting for their dignity, rights and freedom. Take Afghanistan, for instance. The victims of the fanaticism and arbitrariness are ordinary citizens of the republic who want only one thing: to work honestly in a free country. It is they who are the targets of the attacks by the basmaks, whose patrons and inspirers are the White House pharisees. Teachers and education have been held in indisputable respect at all times and among all peoples. These general human values do not exist so far as the basmaks are concerned. In the villages that they manage to burst into under cover of darkness the bandits go for the teachers first, along with the PDPA activists.

Yes, schools bring light and the basmaks are the personification of dark, criminal forces. In the settlement of Asadabad, Konarha Province, the basmaks burned not only the school, but 5,000 textbooks. In Shirin Tabag County, Faryab Province, the basmaks killed eight teachers who had not obeyed demands to renounce their civic and professional duty -- teaching in school.

However, the ringleaders of the gangs do not always vindicate the hopes of their masters in Washington and Beijing. It is becoming increasingly difficult for them to recruit ordinary peasants. The basmaks are using violence to this end. In the village of Dehdadi in Balkh Province the basmaks drove the entire male population into the mosque and forced them to join the gang. They threatened reprisals against the men's families if they refused. A tendency that has been observed lately is for adolescents of 14 and 15 to be recruited to the gangs -- they are initially lured with money payments for insignificant missions.

The members of the basmak gangs have long since become hired cutthroats. Their halo as "freedom fighters" and "fighters for their faith" has long since faded. Now they get paid the statutory price by their patrons for each action -- each PDPA member, teacher or officer killed and each school or hospital burned. They are interested not in ideals, but in cash -- and in hard currency at that. Their masters are not stingy.

Pakistani newspapers recently published data on aid to "Afghan refugees" under the auspices of certain international organizations and agencies and different countries. The main "donor" -- the United States -- has given $200 million in the last 2 years and the Common Market countries have given $50 million. Saudi Arabia, Japan, Australia and other countries each are featured. The total of this "aid" is estimated at $1 billion. Is this all for refugees? But, as the Pakistani press admits, the Afghans who temporarily find themselves on Pakistani territory in the so-called "refugee camps" eke out a pitiful existence. They get nothing of this "aid." So where do these sizable funds end up?

A large part of them is spend on maintaining the basmak gangs that have settled in Pakistan and are making raids on the DRA from its territory, and also on maintaining the military camps where the bandits are trained. Strife over the notorious aid to "Afghan refugees" received from Afghan counterrevolution's imperialist masters is an everyday phenomenon between the ringleaders of the basmak gangs. For instance, (Nabi Mukhammadi) and (Nasrulla), leaders of rival gangs, did not share the "charitable" handouts. The latter accused (Mukhammadi) of appropriating $300,000 of the money received for the maintenance of the "refugees." This example shows once again the kind of rabble that Washington, Beijing and their accomplices are relying on in their struggle against the DRA.

The unjustified brutality against the population, the robberies and extortion, the moral turpitude of the ringleaders of the gangs, the disputes between them over the division of the money handouts from foreign "benefactors", are all causing growing disillusionment among rank-and-file members of the gangs, many of whom ended up in the gangs because of lying propaganda. They are openly expressing discontent and leaving the gangs. To deal with such people, secret prisons into which those who refuse to take part in the plundering raids on DRA territory are thrown are being set up in the camps in Pakistan. Torture is widely used, and particularly refractory people are killed. As awareness grows in the refugee camps and people realize that they have been victims of lying propaganda, more and more people are stating their intention to return home. They are brutally persecuted. The nortorious Gulbuddin Hekmatyar ordered the poisoning of the water in one camp in which some of the Afghan refugees had expressed a wish to return home. Many lives were lost as a result.

The Afghan people and the democratic public throughout the world are demanding that the United States and its accomplices cease supporting the counterrevolutionary basmak movement and the "undeclared war" against the DRA and are demanding that the Afghan people be granted the right to decide their affairs themselves.

The crimes the basmak renegades are committing against the Afghan people are also a stain on the hands of those who are paying them their "thirty pieces of silver" for betraying their people -- Washington, Beijing, Islamabad and their accomplices.

IMELDA MARCOS ARRIVES IN MOSCOW 5 JULY

Guest of Supreme Soviet Presidium

LD051226 Moscow TASS in English 1142 GMT 5 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS — Prominent stateswoman and public leader of the Philippines, minister, Governor of Greater Manila Imelda R. Marcos arrived in Moscow today as guest of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. At the airport the guest and her party were greeted by alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Culture of the USSR Petr Demichev, Vice-President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Bally Yazkuliyev, Deputy Ministers of the USSR Nikolay Firyubin, Tamara Golubtsova, other officials.

Imelda R. Marcos will attend as honorary guest concerts of the concluding part of the Seventh International Tchaikovsky Contest.

Meeting With Kuznetsov

LD051830 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 5 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- Vasiliy Kuznetsov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, received in the Kremlin today a prominent state and public figure of the Philippines, minister, governor of Greater Manila, Imelda R. Marcos, now on a visit in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Vasiliy Kuznetsov conveyed greetings and good wishes from Leonid Brezhnev to President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines and personally to Imelda R. Marcos. During the meeting which passed in a friendly atmosphere the sides touched on Soviet-Philippine relations and certain international problems.

Vasiliy Kuznetsov acquainted Imelda R. Marcos with the achievements of the Soviet people in peaceful construction. He said that in the present complex international situation the Soviet Union consistently came out in favor of peaceful cooperation among the states of all continents, including in favor of the development of friendly ties with the Philippines.

The new peace initiatives set forth in Leonid Brezhnev's message to the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament came as a major contribution to the effort to avert the threat of nuclear war.

Imelda R. Marcos conveyed best wishes to Leonid Brezhnev from President Marcos and from herself personally. On behalf of the president she spoke highly of the Soviet Union's peace initiatives, and its commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Imelda R. Marcos expressed the conviction that friendly relations existing between the two countries would be developing further for the benefit of the peoples of the Philippines and the Soviet Union, in the interests of world peace. She wished the Soviet people progress and prosperity.

NEW COALITION GOVERNMENT OF KAMPUCHEA VIEWED

Interview With SRV's Thach

PM051323 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 82 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report from "The World Today" feature compiled by Yu. Romanov: "Southeast Asia: Shameful Farce"]

[Text] SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach has called the creation of the "Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea" a farce.

In an interview with a TASS correspondent he noted that the Pol Pot supporters who during their rule literally inundated Kampuchea in blood and who have totally discredited themselves in the eyes of the world public continue to play the main role in the "government" which consists of representatives of reactionary Khmer emigre groupings. The inclusion of Sihanouk and Son Sann in the government is designed merely to impart respectability to the relics of the odious genocidal regime.

"World Today" Report

LD030430 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 1 Jul 82

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Kaverznev]

[Text] Reports have appeared in Chinese and Western newspapers that some sort of "coalition government" of Democratic Kampuchean is to meet for its first session in a few days under the chairmanship of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the former Kampuchean ruler. It is reminiscent of the way that in the twenties former Russian princes, would convene monarchist councils somewhere in Europe, with the pretensions to controlling the destinies of our state. The difference, however, is that Sihanouk and his new friends are active today. They enjoy the patronage of the United States, get money from China, wish to become a factor in the political life of Southeast Asia, and are clearly laying claim to the seat of People's Kampuchea in the United Nations.

We already have reported that a week ago, an arriving in Kuala Lumpur, the Malaysian capital, Norodom Sihanouk finally came to an agreement with Khieu Samphan, former president in the Pol Pot regime, and Son Sann, who was prime minister under Sihanouk's rule. They signed a declaration in which they declare themselves president, vice president and prime minister, respectively. Well, all three are deadly enemies. In the West it is thought that Khieu Samphan, a pleasantly-mannered intellectual who has a degree from the Sorbonne in Paris, bears less responsibility for Pol Pot's crimes than others. But Khieu Samphan, even as a 28-year old intellectual, wrote a thesis in Paris on Kampuchea's economic and industrial development. He argued that towns were parasites, that Kampuchea's strength was in her peasants, and that people had to leave the towns and work in agriculture. Well, although not fully, he did work out the ideological basis for one of the cruelest experiments in the history of mankind.

As far as Son Sann, former prime minister under Sihanouk, is concerned, 2 years ago he became enraged when he was accused of attempting to make contact with the remaining Pol Pot men; he said he hated them. He also studied in Paris, founded the National Bank of Cambodia, and now is head of the Khmer emigre organization, which proclaims the power of Buddhism and the necessity for reviving spiritual principles and a code of honor. It is difficult to understand how a cordial accord with the Pol Pot men fits into this code of honor.

As for Sihanouk, I think that you have heard enough about him. In the early seventies he enhanced the prestige of the Pol Pot men for the first time, when he joined them in the jungle. Now he is doing it again. He is the same frivolous playboy, although he is 60; he likes good living, travel. Now, as president of the notorious coalition, he wishes to cultivate harmony -- the phrase is his -- in relations with his new friends, and he is asking for money and arms from anyone prepared to give them to him. In general, we will be glad for the opportunity to pay official visits to Singapore, the Philippines, Indonesia and Thailand.

All this would not merit any attention if this coalition did not pay for its arrogance and its love of pleasure with a promise to conduct coordinated military operations against the popular government in Phnom Penh. Sihanouk told an AFP correspondent that Huang Hua, the Chinese minister of foreign affairs, personally assured him that China would increase its military assistance. The United States is promising political and moral support. These cordial friends will not, of course, return to Kampuchea, but there can be no doubt that they will attempt to reactivate the remaining Pol Pot men and somehow destabilize the situation in Southeast Asia.

ASEAN Concern

BK031256 Moscow in Thai to Thailand 1100 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Ella Zhukova commentary]

[Text] It is normal for a guest to be accorded a warm and friendly reception from the host. However, how can the host admire a person who is joining hands with the Pol Pot clique, which was responsible for the genocide of the Kampuchean people? No one is worse than Prince Sihanouk when it comes to a lack of principles. Not long ago, he made a scathing condemnation of the Pol Pot government as being responsible for the genocide of 3 million Kampucheans and the destruction of the Kampuchean nation. Sihanouk's relatives were among those murdered during the dark era of Pol Pot. To LE MATIN, Sihanouk expressed his anger this way: Who would have predicted that our country would set a record for mass murders?

Prince Sihanouk has now forgotten everything and is happy to accept the role of a facade for the coalition government, whose main gears are turned by Khieu Samphan, Pol Pot's right-hand man who has been appointed vice president. This is incredible. The French paper L'HUMANITE says that many agreed that Pol Pot is the real leader of the ghost government which is made up of the Kampuchean factions of diversified views because the other two factions are really nonexistent, except for their two leaders.

It is absurd for some papers in the ASEAN countries to equate the role of Prince Sihanouk to that of President Sukarno, the famous leader of the Indonesian national liberation movement. The reactions in various Asian circles to the establishment of the notorious coalition government in Kampuchea have been guarded and even negative. The Indian paper PATRIOT says the formation of the coalition government would only heighten tension, because it serves the desire of China and the United States to continue a confrontation between ASEAN and the Indochinese countries. The Indonesian OBSERVER notes with concern that the coalition government could become a tool for China's political plans for Southeast Asia. Its commentary on Prince Sihanouk's visit to Jakarta says that any action aimed at bringing the prince back to Kampuchea can only widen the conflict. It warns that Indonesia should not give any form of support to the prince.

Even though Prince Sihanouk has clamored for support, thus far countries which have pledged to support the coalition government have not shown much enthusiasm in supplying it with arms. Only China has readily expressed willingness to supply weapons to the coalition government. This is not strange, for from the beginning China has been providing military assistance to the Pol Pot clique in its fight against the People's Republic of Kampuchea, and it sees the coalition government as a chance for it to increase this assistance.

China certainly can arm the Pol Pot clique as much as it wants, but the yield from such assistance is questionable. The military success of the coalition government has been questioned everywhere. The London paper FINANCIAL TIMES admits that the coalition government's chances of military success are certainly very slim. Actually there is no chance at all because a legitimate government in Kampuchea has administered the whole country for 3 years now and it has the full support of the people. How would the local people feel about the so-called coalition government? French journalist (Daniel Lucerne) reported from Phnom Penh that survivors of the genocide during the Pol Pot government would never return to hell again.

The ASEAN countries seem to be aware of this. The ASEAN press shows that the ASEAN countries are feeling uneasy because their remarks about a desire for peace, stability and good neighborliness and about noninterference in other countries' internal affairs contradict their actions, which could lead to escalated tension and possibly an armed dispute. It will be very difficult for Prince Sihanouk, the self-proclaimed president, to receive the assistance he hoped to get from his direct negotiations with the leaders of the five ASEAN countries. The reactionary Kampuchean clique's scheme to reverse the national evolution process can only fail.

Sihanouk Derided

LD032248 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2010 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Norodom Sihanouk, the former Cambodian prince, has arrived in Thailand as part of his trip to ASEAN countries. However, this time he has come not simply as an immigrant but as the president of the so-called Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea. As you know, this excuse for a government brings together representatives of the three main groups of Kampuchean counterrevolutionaries.

AP reports that Sihanouk is meeting today with Tinsulanon, Thailand's prime minister, and will be received by the country's king. In all the ASEAN countries this president of a nonexistent government is being given a highly ceremonial welcome. True, as Sihanouk stated with regret at a press conference yesterday, no one has yet offered him weapons for the waging of a struggle against the legal government of Kampuchea. One rather thinks that despite all the pomp with the coalitions, the former prince is quite simply not regarded as a sufficiently serious figure.

Sihanouk, of course, is very self-assured and has even stated his intention of transferring shortly across the Thailand border into Kampuchean territory and heading the armed struggle there. One rather thinks however, that the army and population of the People's Republic of Kampuchea will give Sihanouk and his fancies an appropriate reception.

FIRYUBIN MEETS SRV VICE FOREIGN MINISTER, ENVOY

OW032046 Moscow in Vietnamese to Vietnam 1000 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Soviet Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Firyubin has received SRV Vice Foreign Minister Vo Dong Giang during the latter's stopover in Moscow. The two sides conferred on issues of mutual concern in a friendly atmosphere.

Comrade Firyubin has also given a banquet in honor of the outgoing SRV ambassador to the Soviet Union, Nguyen Huu Mai.

INDONESIAN MINISTER ON U.S.-CHINESE TIES

PM051451 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 82 p 5

[TASS report: "Profound Concern"]

[Text] New York, 23 Jun -- Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja has expressed the Southeast Asian states' profound concern in connection with widening cooperation between the United States and China. In a NEWSWEEK interview he said that "Washington tends to assess world events in global, superpower terms," views everything "only in black and white" and is building its relations with China on the basis of anti-Sovietism. "Moreover," the minister said, "the other Asian countries for whom China is something quite different are falling out of the general picture." And, the minister stressed, the ASEAN states -- of which Indonesia is one -- believe that "the biggest threat to Southeast Asia comes from China."

Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja made it clear that most countries in the regional grouping are definitely at variance with efforts to give the impression that the threat to Southeast Asia comes from Socialist Vietnam.

JOINT SOVIET-FRENCH SPACE MISSION COMPLETED

Successful Soyuz Landing

LD021528 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS -- At 18:21 Moscow time today, following the successful completion of the joint research and experimental programme aboard the orbital complex "Salyut-7" -- "Soyuz T-5" -- "Soyuz T-6" the international crew consisting of Pilot-Cosmonaut of the USSR Vladimir Dzhanibekov, twice Hero of the Soviet Union; Pilot-Cosmonaut of the USSR Aleksandr Ivanchenkov, Hero of the Soviet Union; and Jean-Loup Chretien, a citizen of the French Republic, returned to earth. Work aboard the "Salyut-7" station is continued by cosmonauts Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev.

The descent module of the "Soyuz T-6" spaceship landed in the present area of the territory of the Soviet Union, 65 kilometres north-east of the city of Arkalyk. Cosmonauts Vladimir Dzhanibekov, Aleksandr Ivanchenkov and Jean-Loup Chretien are in good health upon landing.

During the work of the international crew aboard the orbital station "Salyut-7" -- "Soyuz T-5" -- Soyuz T-6" the research programme planned by scientists and specialists from the Soviet Union and France was accomplished in full. Studies of the earth atmosphere, the interplanetary medium and galactic and extragalactic rediations sources were conducted in the course of the mission. Experiments were carried out on the "Kristal" unit under a programme of materials study in outer space to examine the processes of diffusion and crystallization of metal alloys under weightless conditions and to further improve space production techniques.

Medical and biological research featured prominently in the mission's programme. New information was obtained on the adaptation of the human organism to weightlessness and a number of experiments carried out to study the influence of the factors of space flight on the development of different biological objects.

In the course of their further flight aboard the "Salyut-7" station cosmonauts Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev will continue the experiments prepared by Soviet and French scientists.

The successful completion of the mission of the international crew with the participation of a French cosmonaut marks a major step in the further fruitful cooperation of the Soviet Union and France in the peaceful exploration of outer space in the interests of both countries.

Crew Awarded Decorations

LD021844 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS -- By its decisions, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has awarded high decorations to the Soviet-French crew for their successful implementation of a space flight in the orbital "Salyut-7" -- "Soyuz" research complex and displaying courage and heroism in the process.

The crew's commander -- two times a Hero of the Soviet Union -- Vladimir Dzhanibekov is awarded with an Order of Lenin. The flight engineer, Hero of the Soviet Union Aleksandr Ivanchenkov, is awarded with an Order of Lenin and the second "Gold Star" medal. As a two times Hero of the Soviet Union, at his birthplace his bronze bust will be erected in his honour. The citizen of the French Republic, Cosmonaut-Researcher Jean-Loup Chretien is awarded the title of a Hero of the Soviet Union, an Order of Lenin and a "Gold Star" medal.

Mitterrand Sends Greetings

LD022204 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS: Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic, has sent a message of greetings to Cosmonaut-Researcher Jean-Loup Chretien. It reads:

At the time of your return upon the successful completion of the entire programme of the space mission, I want to convey to you and also to your Soviet colleagues, Vladimir Aleksandrovich Dzhanibekov and Aleksandr Sergeyevich Ivanchenkov, my personal congratulations.

This mission will yield a vast amount of information which is valuable to the international science community and which will lead medicine and biology, materials studies and astronomy to new achievements.

This mission also is the most graphic proof of fruitful cooperation which has been developing for over 15 years now between the Soviet Union and France in studying and exploring outer space for peaceful purposes with a continuous striving for the greatest possible mutual benefit.

Lastly, it is a symbol of the goodwill of the French people to build European peace on the basis of traditional relations of friendship, respect for the fights formalised in the Helsinki accords and the extension of good relations among all the peoples of our continent.

Space Crew Interviewed

LD031852 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1145 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Baykonur Cosmodrome, 3 Jul (TASS) -- The space crew which returned to Earth, the spaceship and the scientific luggage of the expedition went their different ways after the landing. The descent module will be delivered to the enterprise where it was made so that the engineers may study it thoroughly. The results of the experiments -- film and samples of materials -- have been sent to scientific centers in the USSR and France. The cosmonauts are making a stopover of several days at the cosmodrome where they will undergo after-flight medical examinations and have a rest.

Phone calls have been reaching the Kosmonavt Hotel since this morning. The members of the Soviet-French expedition received congratulations on the successful landing and on the high awards. Appearing in good spirits and rested, they came out to meet the journalists.

In reply to the first question concerning the progress of the descent, Vladimir Dzhanibekov answered: "There was nothing unexpected. Not even it seemed to me, for Jean-Loup Chretien. The computer on board directed the landing program marvelously."

Aleksandr Ivanchenkov said: "I noticed that the timelag between issuing a command and its execution -- for example on reentry into the atmosphere -- was only half a second. Hence the high precision with which the descent module approached the point for landing."

"Thank you for your reliability" -- the cosmonauts wrote these words before leaving the spaceship. Today they unanimously confirmed that the Soyuz-1 is an excellent vehicle. It works with the precision of the strictest chronometer, Jean-Loup Chretien emphasized.

Jean-Loup and his Soviet friends willingly answered all questions put to them by the journalists. The French cosmonaut said in part that a week of work on board the station is quite sufficient for gathering professional experience and appreciating all the difficulties of activity in space. Were it not for the help we received from our hosts Anatoliy and Valentin, he admitted, we would hardly have been able to cope so successfully with the intensive program of experiments.

To the park surrounding the Kosmonavt Hotel, in the lane where Yuriy Gagarin planted the first tree, one more sapling has now been added. This is a 2-year old English elm tree which was planted by the first French cosmonaut. It symbolizes successful continuation of peaceful orbital flights, which are a great contribution by Soviet scientists, engineers and cosmonauts to world science and to strengthening friendship among peoples

REACTION TO PIPELINE BAN, PROSPECTS OF TRADE WAR

Zamyatin Commentary

LD031520 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS — Leonid Zamyatin described the Reagan administration's decision to substantially expand the ban on the sales of oil and gas equipment to the Soviet Union as interference in the internal affairs of the U.S. allies and their economies. Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee, was speaking in the "Studio 9" a Soviet television program.

The purpose of the decision of the U.S. administration with respect to the "gas-pipes" deal, Leonid Zamyatin said, was to prevent Western countries from solving their energy problems in cooperation with the Soviet Union. President Reagan, Leonid Zamyatin went on to say, took a decision which in effect boiled down to a situation whereby the sanctions, initially imposed on U.S. deliveries for this project, were now being spread to Western European manufacturers if they worked on U.S. licenses or if they were in some way connected with U.S. capital.

Touching on the resignation of the U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig, Leonid Zamyatin expressed the view that this may toughen President Reagan's policies. It is quite possible, said he, that this will include economic sanctions which will affect both Western European countries and Japan as the principal competitors of the United States.

Shishlin Commentary

LD042000 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Jul 82

[Text] Western Europe is rebuffing the White House's attempts to prevent the implementation of the agreement on the supply of Soviet natural gas to Western Europe. President Mitterrand of France called Washington's action a "bad method." Dankett, chairman of the European Parliament, noted that Western Europe will not permit U.S. interference in the construction of the mutually advantageous gas pipeline. Here is a late news commentary by the international affairs journalist Nikolay Shishlin.

[Shishlin] A few weeks ago at Versailles, Europeans, Japanese and Canadians in a fairly friendly manner opposed American pressure to implement broad economic sanctions against our country. But the participants in the meeting of the seven big capitalist states scarcely had time to be pleased or disappointed at the results of this meeting when Washington took a further step. And it must be said that this step has evoked an extremely stormy reaction in Europe. The Europeans are not simply disagreeing with this action. Firms are not only reaffirming their readiness to cooperate with the Soviet Union in implementing the gas pipeline deal, they are also stating that extending American jurisdiction to others in the international community is intolerable. We, of course, know perfectly well that the United States' word carries some weight in the capitalist world, but the interests of Western Europe are their own affair.

The West Europeans know perfectly well that the United States wants to hurt not only the Soviet Union, but also its own competitors in Western Europe. So this attack has a multiple purpose, and this is intolerable to Western Europe. So, in this respect, I believe that Washington's latest tough action will not bring any sound, tangible results. But there is another main point. By trying to artificially sever the business relations of their partners with the socialist world, they are simply underestimating the potential of the socialist states themselves. In the final analysis, the huge potential of the socialist states was created not by means of Western credits and not with Western assistance, but by the selfless efforts of the socialist peoples. Indeed, there is no complex economic task which is not within the capability of the socialist states or within the capability of the Soviet Union. That is why I believe that the Reagan administration's decision to further poison international relations will prove in the final analysis to be bankrupt in the practical sense.

Kalyagin on European Opposition

LD031620 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 3 Jul 82

[From the Vremya newscast, by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Not so long ago the famous London weekly THE ECONOMIST started its leading article with an unexpected question: Has the Atlantic Ocean grown wider since Ronald Reagan became President of the United States? There have of course, been no geographical changes, but to judge from the long list of mutual recriminations and accusations, America and Western Europe are moving farther apart. The disagreements concern various areas -- political, military and economic -- and while Western European capitals used to confine themselves to grumbling that Washington makes decisions without consulting its partners, the dissatisfaction with the White House's policies has grown into an open revolt. There can be no other word for the statement by the foreign ministers of the Common Market countries to the effect that U.S. actions run counter to international law and are unacceptable to the European Community.

America's Western European partners are annoyed that the Reagan administration is no longer just ignoring their interests but is directly causing them economic and political damage with its actions. Quite a few instances have now piled up: the fixing of high interest rates that undermine Western European currencies, restrictions on steel imports from the Common Market countries, and attempts to disrupt the Ten's agricultural exports. The drop that made the cup of patience overflow, as far as America's western partners were concerned, was, in all probability, Washington's decision to expand sanctions on supplies of equipment for construction of the gas pipeline from the Soviet Union to Western Europe. The United States demanded that a great many Western European companies repudiate contracts they had already signed with our country on the grounds that the equipment they were supplying included parts manufacturing under American licenses. That meant that the Western firms would suffer major losses and that tens of thousands of their workers might find themselves out on the streets -- and at a time when Western Europe is undergoing profound depression and growing unemployment. Western Europeans were also annoyed that the American Government felt free to dictate terms to European companies and transfer its own laws to other people's territories regardless of other countries' sovereignty. Who should we listen to, Western European businessmen are wondering -- our own government or that across the Atlantic?

Even as loyal a Washington allay as Margaret Thatcher, has come out against the American President's decision. The British Government has taken an unprecedented step by announcing that if British companies are threatened by American sanctions it will impose its own ban on Washington's embargo. Other Western European governments may well follow in Britain's wake too. They do not want to get involved in the East-West trade war that the Reagan administration is trying to unleash. The White House's attempts to pressure its partners have reinforced their lack of confidence in the present Washington leadership's policies.

Drobkov on Trade War

PM010815 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 82 p 6

[V. Drobkov dispatch under rubric "Commentator's Column:" "A Grip of Steel"]

[Text] Brussels -- Scarcely had the echo of the fireworks display on the grounds of the Palace of Versailles to mark the meeting of the leaders of the leading capitalist countries died down when the cannonade resumed with renewed force in the trade "war" between them. The U.S. Department of Commerce accused 7 of the 10 EEC countries of oversubsidizing their steel industries. This is why Washington is erecting a near insurmountable barrier of surcharges in the path of West European steel exports to the United States.

"Reagan is closing the door to EEC steel and the commerical world is under threat," states the headline of a commentary in the Brussels newspaper LE SOIR, sounding the alarm. The aim of the Reagan administration, which is acting in its own industry's interests, is to banish European steel from the U.S. market, Paris's LE MONDE echoes.

In the view of local observers and "Common Market" experts, Washington's decision will do enormous damage to the EEC countries' metallurgical industries and in all probability will trigger a chain reactionof protectionism measures on each side of the Atlantic. The U.S. actions "are regrettable and have caused enormous disappointment in the EEC," said G. Thorn, president of the Commission of the European Communities. E. Davignon, his deputy for industrial affairs, has announced that the commission is compiling a list of U.S. goods whose production is also subsidized and on whose export to West Europe's similar restrictions may be introduced.

A number of West European countries have openly accused Washington of "violating the spirit of Versailles" and of protectionism. "For the first time in years there is a real possibility of a trade war between Europe and the United States," London's FINANCIAL TIMES writes in this connection.

Such a sharp reaction by West Europeans is easily explained. For several years now the EEC countries' steel industries have been in the grip of a deep crisis. The level of production has fallen sharply -- many enterprises in this sector are working at scarcely half capacity and others are threatened with total bankruptcy. Tens of thousands of metallurgical industry workers have already lost their jobs. And at this tense moment, yielding to the demands of its own steel concerns, Washington has decided to limit imports of metal from the EEC to around four million tons a year. For this purpose duties on imported West European steel are to be increased by more than a third, which will have the effect of sharply reducing imports.

So, within days of the phoney display of willingness to cooperate with his European partners put on by the U.S. President in Versailles, the U.S. administration has abandoned the carrot of talk of "Western solidarity" for the stick of economic sanctions, dealing a heavy blow to the closest U.S. allies in the process. West Europeans have once again felt on their throat the steel grip of U.S. monopolies which can count on Washington's full support.

Schmidt Criticism Cited

PM021505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 82 p 5

[TASS report: "Speech by FRG Chancellor"]

[Text] Bonn, 25 Jun — FRG Chancellor H. Schmidt made a government statement in the Bundestag 24 June. A substantial part of his statement was devoted to crises in the world economic system. He said in particular that the economies of the world's states, including those of Western industrial countries, are going through a serious crisis. The crisis is compounding the problems of providing for hundreds of millions of people and is particularly seriously affecting many millions of people in the developing countries.

H. Schmidt pointed out that the state of the U.S. economy is one of the factors influencing the world economic situation. In this connection he served a reminder that excessive U.S. interest rates are hampering the growth of the world economy and in so doing adversely affecting employment. One of the main reasons for the hike in interest rates is the U.S. budget deficit. Even President Reagan admitted this in Versailles, the FRG Chancellor stated. For several months now we have been following an unending public battle to reduce the U.S. budget deficit, universally regarded as too high.

East-West economic relations were an important topic at the recent Versailles meeting, H. Schmidt went on. Everyone agreed that these relations must be conducted strictly in accordance with the principle of mutual advantage and that they must be limited. But this must be done with due regard for commerical needs.

But what there must not be and what we will not take part in, even after Versailles, is a trade war with the Soviet Union, which would usher in a new era of cold war, the chancellor stressed.

Together with its European partners the Federal Government noted with concern and regret that the U.S. administration's decision to obstruct the Soviet-European "gas for pipes" deal by banning the export of important components and the use of licenses already issued for the planned gas pipeline. The EEC Council said: "This action, taken without any consultation with the community, is an extraterritorial application of U.S. laws which in these circumstances is at variance with the principles of international law and is therefore unacceptable to the community and to all appearances will not be recognized by the courts of the EEC countries."

Of course, the chancellor went on, European governments were aware of the U.S. administration's critical attitude toward the deal, which was also discussed during meetings in recent weeks, but the question of the U.S. intention to extend the scope of their embargo did not arise at them.

Like our European partners we will stand by the "gas for pipes" deal. We are acting thus because this deal will help us to achieve the diversification of our sources of energy supply, which is essential to us. We have guaranteed that as a result of this deal we will not be dependent. We shall and must honor the contracts. We have never given our U.S. partners any reason to doubt this position.

Together with our European partners we must now hold talks with the U.S. administration to guarantee that the U.S. decision does no harm to the continued economic cooperation between Europe and the United States desired by all sides. This relates primarily to the extension of the territorial impact of U.S. decisions.

H. Schmidt went on to dwell on the question of the decisions adopted at the Bonn session of the NATO Council. He reiterated his support for R. Reagan's well-known proposals aimed at upsetting the existing military balance between the USSR and the United States. The chancellor spoke in favor of the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in West Europe, claiming without foundation that the European states are threatened by "the Soviet Union's buildup of its medium-range missile armory."

H. Schmidt called for a U.S.-USSR dialogue, summit level included, after stressing the importance of the accord on holding talks on limiting strategic arms. In doing so, however, he sidestepped the real issue, reducing everything to urging the need for talks between the two superpowers. H. Schmidt concluded his speech by dwelling on relations between the GDR and FRG.

BREZHNEV, PERTINI EXCHANGE TELEGRAMS OF GREETINGS

LD011306 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 1 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- Leonid Brezhnev has sent to Alessandro Pertini, president of the Italian Republic, a telegram conveying to him and the friendly Italian people greetings and best wishes in connection with the country's national holiday, Republic Day.

I am certain, the telegram says, that the further extension of cooperation between our two countries on a mutually beneficial basis meets the interests of the Soviet and Italian peoples and contributes towards a peaceful future for Europe.

In a reply telegram the Italian president expressed his cordial gratitude for the greetings and on his part conveyed sincere wishes of wellbeing personally to Leonid Brezhnev and prosperity to the friendly Soviet people.

GROMYKO DISCUSSES LEBANON WITH ARAB MINISTERS

LD051524 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1450 GMT 5 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jul (TASS) -- A.A. Gromyko, Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs, today received Sabah al-Ahmad as-Sabah, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs of Kuwait; M. Boucetta, minister of state for foreign affairs of Morocco; and F. Qaddumi, chief of the Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization's Executive Committee, who arrived in Moscow on a short working visit at the request of the special committee on Lebanon of the league of Arab states.

Sabah al-Ahmad as-Sabah, M. Boucetta and F. Qaddumi reported on the Arab countries' position in connection with Israel's aggression in Lebanon and expressed profound anxiety over the present situation in the Near East.

On Behalf of the Soviet leadership, A.A. Gromyko reaffirmed that the Soviet Union is directing its practical actions, its weight and influence in international affairs toward the prevention of mass bloodshed in Beirut and toward the aggressor's leaving Lebanon. He said that the Soviet Union comes out firmly in favor of Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. A.A. Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union, following its principled policy, will continue with all resolution to support the just cause of the Arab peoples against Israel's aggression and the imperialist forces behind it.

It was stressed during the conversation that Israel's marauding attack on Lebanon, the genocide the Israeli military is carrying out against the Palestinian people, and its misdeeds against the Lebanese have heated up the situation in the Near East and are endangering international security. In this connection special attention was devoted to the fact that a situation of this kind requires the unity and cohesion of the Arab countries and peoples as never before.

Sabah al-Ahmad as-Sabah, M. Boucetta and F. Qaddumi spoke highly of the Soviet Union's consistent policy with regard to rebuffing Israeli aggression, its solidarity with the Arab people's struggle for their freedom and independence, for protecting the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, and for establishing a just and stable peace in the Near East.

The conversation took place in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere.

PRAVDA DEVOTES LEADING ARTICLE TO LEBANESE CRISIS

LD052113 Moscow TASS in English 2108 GMT 5 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS -- "Historical experience demonstrates: Only a general settlement, and not the policy of 'big stick', diktat and separate deals, can give peace to Mid-Eastern peoples", the newspaper PRAVDA writes today.

In its leading article "Peace to the Middle East" the paper writes that the "blood-shedding developments in Lebanon are a direct result of the U.S. policy of turning the Middle East into its major military and political jumping-off ground, its desire to control the natural riches of the region, especially oil".

"Before the Israeli invasion of Lebanon which has become the fifth Mid-Eastern war in the past thirty years", PRAVDA writes, "Tel Aviv and Washington have set themselves definite aims: to destroy the Palestine Liberation Organisation, to install an obedient regime in Lebanon, to weaken Syria and oust its troops from Lebanese territory where they are stationed under the flag of the Arab League. The matter at hand is essentially a fresh attempt of imperialism and Zionism to deal a blow at Arab progressive, national-liberation forces, to deprive the Palestinian people of their combat vanguard, in the first place".

"The stake has been made on brute force, international banditry and outright genocide", PRAVDA writes. "Israeli troops, using weapons supplied from across the ocean, including such barbarous means of warfare as pellet and phosphorus bombs, napalm and toxic agents, are trying to drown the Palestine Resistance movement in blood".

"But the aggressor and its patrons must be well aware", the paper writes, "that it is impossible to destroy the Palestinian people just like it is impossible to suppress their striving for peace and independence. The Palestinian resistance movement reached a rather high degree of maturity and organisation in recent years. It has been recognized by the international community, and it relies on the decisions of the United Nations which has repeatedly reaffirmed complete legitimacy of the demand of Palestinian Arabs to decide their destiny themselves".

The leading article stresses further that "continuing its criminal actions, the aggressor challenges the entire international community which is indignant at Israel's arbitrariness. This is evidenced by a momentous tide of protests which has swept many countries and by a complete isolation of Israel and the United States which backs it at the session of the United Nations General Assembly. Only the delegations of these two countries voted against the resolution condemning the invasion of Lebanon with 127 countries voting in favour of the said resolution. It is difficult to find an example of a greater political and moral defeat suffered by Washington and its mid-Eastern gendarme -- Israel -- in the internal arena".

"One cannot overlook the fact", PRAVDA writes, "that the U.S.-Israeli alliance has a pronounced anti-Soviet taint. Tel Aviv has more than once offered its territory for the establishment of U.S. bases and its harbours for the visits of the 6th U.S. Fleet based in the Mediterranean Sea. It is clear that all this is directed against the Soviet Union. At the same time this increasingly draws such a small country, as Israel, into a dangerous confrontation in the international arena".

PRAVDA notes that "the invasion of Lebanon raises with all acuteness the question of the situation in the Middle East as a whole, again reminds one of the need of an early settlement of the conflict in this part of the world, a conflict fraught with dangerous outbursts. The tragedy of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples is a direct result of the general uncertainty of the situation in the Middle East, and of the adventuristic policy of the United States which has embarked on the road of separate deals in the mould of the Camp David collusion which has only untied the hands of the Israeli aggressor and aggravated the situation further".

"Today the Soviet people together with the progressive forces of the world", the leading article says, "say a resolute 'no' to Israel's banditry, 'no' to U.S. diktat in the Middle East. They solidarise with the right cause of the Palestinian people, demand an end to aggression and the withdrawal of intervention troops from Lebanese territory".

ISRAEL BENT ON ELIMINATION OF PALESTINIANS

LD031538 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS -- Lebanon has become a fresh victim of the Israeli aggression. This comes as a consequence of the policy charted jointly by the United States and Israel, a policy which is aimed above all at eroding the unity of Arab countries, undermining a common front of Arab states and gradually wresting one Arab country after another from this front.

This was said by Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee. He was speaking on Soviet television.

The Israeli aggression in Lebanon is an elaborate plan that was initiated by Israel's Defence Minister Sharon. On the eve of the invasion of Lebanon he visited the United States and received the last 'okay' for going ahead with the implementation of this plan.

Leonid Zamyatin said that a new element in the situation in the Middle East was the fact that the elimination of a two-million-strong Palestinian people had begun.

Israel, stressed he, was bent on a complete destruction of the Palestinian people.

ISRAELI USE OF U.S. WEAPONS IN LEBANON VIEWED

Olin Commentary

LD031126 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] There have been more reports that Israeli forces in Lebanon are using chemical weapons. Our commentary is by Viktor Olin. This is what he writes:

Such reports appeared only last week, but there is evidence that shows that the Israelis started using chemical weapons as soon as they invaded Lebanon. Nerve gas bombs were dropped, for example, in the Beaufort fortress in the south. Similar incidents have been reported from mountainous areas east of Beirut, from the Beirut-Damascus highway and other places. All this means that Israel is making massive use of warfare techniques that are denounced by international law and world public opinion as being among the most inhuman.

Paradoxically as it may seem, Washington's reaction to reports of Israeli chemical warfare in Lebanon has been absolute silence. It is indeed a paradox, because for a month Washington has been making indignant statements over the alleged use of Soviet-made chemical weapons in Indochina and Afghanistan, and that despite numerous facts showing that the chemical weapons used there were of American make.

In all likelihood, the United States some time ago supplied such weapons to Israel. What appears to indicate this is the fact that Israel has for years been testing the newest types of American arms in its wars against neighboring Arab countries. During his recent visit to the United States, the Israeli prime minister, Menahem Begin, said bluntly that the Washington administration should be thankful to Israel that it was serving America's interest by testing its latest types of weapons in the fighting in Lebanon. The Pentagon must indeed be interested in having its chemical weapons tested since these weapons are a major part of its giant military program for the next few years.

The Pentagon plans to spend up to $10 billion on chemical rearmament, though it already has enough chemical warfare agents to kill the world's population four times over. To assure itself a free hand in this field, Washington has made several political moves. In 1980 it withdrew from the talks with the Soviet Union on chemical weapons problems. The United States was alone among the 157 member countries of the United Nations to vote against a General Assembly resolution urging the states not to manufacture chemical weapons and not to deploy them in those countries that do not have them at present.

Such is the background of Israel's chemical warfare in Lebanon and it is just one part of the war it is waging in that country with American-made napalm, pellet, cluster and phosphorus bombs which have already killed or injured tens of thousands of peaceful civilians in Lebanon.

Vishnevskiy Article

LD041004 Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 4 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow, July 4 TASS -- "Bellicose Zionism and its supporters are disclosing themselves for the whole world to see," commentator Sergey Vishnevskiy writes today in an international review in the newspaper PRAVDA. "The proportions of Israeli atrocities and violence in Lebanon shock even the much-experienced Western reporters. 15,000 killed, more than 50,000 wounded, hundreds of thousands refugees -- this is far from being the complete list of victims of interventionists. On pages of Western newspapers where the slightest criticism of Zionist extremists was prohibited till the recent time, one can find direct comparison of the heinous deeds of the Israeli military with fascists' crimes." More frequently the aggression against Lebanon is called Israeli-American -- and there is no exaggeration in that. Washington fully supports the aims of the interventionists -- to liquidate the Palestine Resistance movement, to establish an "obedient" regime in Lebanon and to undermine independence of other Arab countries.

According to former Senator James Abourezk, the U.S. Government issued to Israel "a licence to kill" Arabs. The Pentagon, the commentator writes, actually uses the long-suffering soil of Lebanon as the ground for testing the most barbarous types of weapons — cluster, pellet and phosphorus bombs, fragmentation shells, chemical toxic agents. Many thousand Arabs have already fell victim to novelties of American military equipment. General A. Yariv boasted at a press- conference in Tel Aviv that planes used in Lebanon American bombs which are of exceedingly high killing power.

"But if one turns to the essence of the matter, it is clear that though the aggressor's troops approached Beirut, Tel Aviv and Washington did not approach an inch solution [as received] of the Middle East problem. The notorious 'military successes' cannot conceal political defeat of the American-Israeli course in the Middle East."

"The Arab peoples now very clearly see who their sworn enemies are. The accomplices in the aggression are getting together into the ring of international isolation. They are still to learn the consequences of their adventurism, by meeting the growing rebuff of the freedom-loving peoples," PRAVDA writes in its international review.

TASS Report

LD051126 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT 5 Jul 82

[Text] Beirut July 5 TASS — American weapons of mass destruction, used by Israel during its aggression against Lebanon, are now displayed in west Beirut. These include the types of weapons and ammunition banned by international conventions. Among them are six types of American-made pellet bombs intended for destroying manpower. They were used in densely populated districts of west Beirut. One air missile contains 350 pellets which explode on impact with an obstacle. Also on display are plastic bombs filled with incendiary mixtures and designed for causing fires in populated localities.

Delayed-action missiles and bombs were widely used by Israeli planes. They exploded several hours after hitting the ground at a time when rescue teams were working on bombing sites. As a result many members of civil defence units as well as medical workers and residents who helped with the evacuation of the wounded, were killed. Israeli artillery used phosphorous 155-mm shells when attacking west Beirut. Such shells, when exploding, release great heat which causes burns to those who happen to be in the explosion zone.

ISRAELI, U.S. POSITIONS ON LEBANON ANALYZED

LD012330 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 1 Jul 82

[From "The World Today" program presented by A. Kaverznev]

[Text] Elaborate negotiations are underway in and around the Near East. Not all the details are known but some things are clear. The main consideration may be that Israel's and the United States' position of ultimatum remains unchanged in principle, although their tactics may have changed slightly.

White House spokesman Larry Speakes told journalists what instructions President Reagan gave his emissary in the Near East, Philip Habib. First of all, together with Israel, he must strive for the withdrawal from Lebanon of all foreign forces. What does that mean? Speakes explained that this applies first of all to the Palestinians. To journalists' requests for precision, he answered — and I quote — "at the present time the administration does not specify anybody else." In other words, the talk is about the same dispersion, if not annihilation, of the Palestinians who have found refuge in Lebanon.

Other points in Reagan's instructions also coincide with Begin's plans — to create in Lebanon a strong, or more accurately, a government loyal to Israel, to create in southern Lebanon some kind of demilitarized zone where Begin would like very much to see American soldiers, and to continue the Camp David process.

The only thing that Begin, and especially his Defense Minister Sharon, does not seem to like is Reagan's request to refrain from resuming fighting for as long as possible. And Israel is in a hurry.

PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat told an American UPI correspondent: According to information we have, the Israelis have 11 to 12 divisions here in Lebanon. They have moved eight of the divisions to Beirut, and not just to stop at the gates of Beirut. They must go into action this week at the latest with all the might which Sharon has been supplied by the Americans. By the way, 'Arafat gave this interview in a small underground shelter, in a study in a fortified area near the Palestinian refugee camp of Sabra, which is being subjected to fierce bombing and shelling.

According to the UPI correspondent, 'Arafat was cheerful, felt at ease, and literally radiated vital energy and refused to consider that his organization in Beirut had been dealt a deadly blow. By the way, in other interviews these days 'Arafat has repeatedly said that it is wrong to think that the entire infrastructure of the Palestine resistance is concentrated in Beirut, it is more widely diversified and because of that the fighting spirit of the Palestinians is strong. So what then is compelling Israel to force the events? Partly the knowledge that its so-called limited operation for which Sharon gave 4 to 5 days has turned into the longest and most fierce Arab-Israeli war since 1948. Today is the 28th day.

Now you see Israeli supporters, south Lebanese separatists, Phalangists. We received this video recording today. They are at shooting practice. Neither the military nor the psychological terror have managed to subdue the Palestinians.

Israel is also annoyed that Tel Aviv and Washington, although indirectly, have had political contacts with the PLO which they do not want to recognize. In this connection Yasir 'Arafat said ironically: With whom is Habib dealing? Surely not with ghosts, 'Arafat has proposed that Habib -- you now see Habib -- jump over the kilometers from the eastern sector of Beirut to the western and talk to him without intermediaries.

According to a report by the American journalist (?Shippley), Begin is afraid to prolong the siege of Beirut for weeks or months because of the growth of the antiwar movement within Israel itself. Between 10,000 and 20,000 people have taken part in demonstrations in Tel Aviv. And finally Begin fears all sorts of tactical tricks by Washington after Haig was replaced in the post of secretary of state by Shultz. You see Shultz. True, today Israeli radio reported with pleasure that despite his resignation Haig will deal with Israeli affairs for another 2 weeks. You must take into consideration that the public and some influential political circles in the United States are not pleased with such sharply displayed extremism of Israel. The resons are not simple.

The alleged annoyance of the Amerians does not mean that they are sympathizing with the Palestinians or the Lebanese. The United States has its own considerations. It wants to continue the Camp David process in that wide sense which signifies a desire to continue to divide the Arab world -- more accurately, to isolate separate countries, and create new Egypts, as the Americans say, and to compel one after another to have more or less close relations with Israel and America.

And here there are some narrow-minded contradictions for the Americans concerning the terrorists Begin and Sharon, who would like to see around Israel not even pro-American Arab governments, but simply some kind of power vacuum. From this point of view, as the New York TIMES writes, the victory of Sharonism in Jerusalem brings no joy either to the Americans or to many Israelis.

It is natural that some Americans are sincerely angered because Israel, in its inhuman aggressive aims, uses American weapons, and this is prohibited by UN laws. Senator Clayborne Pell says with sadness that the death of every child, the destruction of every building turned into heaps of stones and rubbish is the result of the use of American weapons. And if you take all that into consideration, then I think it is possible to make a careful assumption that under the effect of circumstances arising from the specific situation now in Beirut, all the same and although for different motives, it is possible that a suitable way out for the PLO will be found.

U.S.-S. AFRICA ACCORD ON NAMIBIA DRAWS COMMENT

TASS Analyst Kulik

LD021944 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 2 Jul 82

["Not 'Progress' but a Blind Alley" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Sergey Kulik writes:

President Reagan said at his latest press conference that considerable progress has been reached on the problem of Namibia's future during the recent talks in Washington between Chester Crocker, assistant U.S. secretary of state for African Affairs, and a South African Governmental delegation.

However, what the White House chief tries to pass off as "progress" is viewed by the whole of Africa as nothing but a step back. Washington and Pretoria, in particular, reached agreement during those talks on a "single programme", in accordance with which they are actually going to keep the United Nations out of the Namibian settlement.

According to the scheme of the American colonialists and their Pretoria accomplices, if elections are called in Namibia the international peace-keeping force in this country should consist exclusively of the troops of the U.S. and its NATO allies. Apparently, their purpose will be not the ensuring of democracy in Namibia but provision of conditions for continued U.S. military presence.

It is obviously to gain time that both sides made another attempt to artificially link the problem of granting independence to Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from neighboring Angola. Meanwhile, everyone knows that the Cuban troops contingent stays in the People's Republic of Angola at the request of the government of that country to ensure its security in the conditions of the incessant aggression of the Republic of South Africa. Both Havana and Luanda have stressed on more than one occasion that Cuban troops will be withdrawn from the People's Republic of Angola only if the threat of any aggression against Angola is removed.

Arbitrarily linking two absolutely different questions, the Namibian settlement and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, Washington is thus trying to give South Africa a free hand in carrying out its terrorist policy and to provide for the racists in Africa similar conditions to those enjoyed by Israel in the Middle East.

While Reagan tries to convince world public opinion that the American-South African deal struck in Washington leads to "progress" on the Namibian problem, the African patriots hold a diametrically opposite view. The talks on Namibia's future have been stalemated precisely through the fault of the United States and the other NATO powers encouraging South Africa, Hedipo Hamutenya, member of the SWAPO Central Committee, said in an interview to the newspaper New York TIMES, denouncing the attempts of Washington and Pretoria to make Namibian independence conditional on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA

LD030636 Moscow TASS in English 0620 GMT 3 Jul 82

["Manoevures Around Namibia" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS -- Rapproachement between the United States and the Republic of South Africa, specifically in the military sphere lends a new dangerous aspect to the Namibian problem, writes the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. There is growing evidence that Washington and Pretoria intend to envigorate their interference in the south of the African continent. The shadow of racist aggression invariably hangs over the "Frontline States."

The U.S. is rendering ever-growing support to gangs of the ringleader of the anti-Angolan grouping UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] J. Savimbi, who is maintained by the U.S. CIA and secret services of the Republic of South Africa. In the light of these facts, one can hardly doubt that acts of armed invasion of Angola by the racist military are conducted if not on direct instruction of Washington, then with its tacit approval. The aim of these bandit sallies is clear: to create in the south of Angola a buffer zone in order [that] Savimbi could consolidate there, to make the Angolan Government, under the threat of destabilization of the situation in the country, to give up support of the Namibian patriots.

In this connection the newspaper cites President of the People's Republic of Mozambique Samora Machel as saying that Pretoria's aggressive course does not differ at all from the policy of Zionist Israel, which unleased aggression against sovereign Lebanon and which perpetrates there barbarous repressions against civilians.

Thus, the newspaper stresses, the United States along with Pretoria, bears the main responsibility for Namibia's continuing illegal occupation by South Africa's racists, for the escalation of terror and repressions of the South African military against the Namibian and other African peoples. But, as is shown by history, even the most powerful military machine is unable to break peoples' will for freedom and independence.

MINISTER HEADS UGANDAN DELEGATION ON USSR VISIT

PM021247 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 82 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Guests From Uganda"]

[Text] A delegation from the Uganda People's Congress Party [UPC] headed by P. Masette-Kuuya, minister for rehabilitation, has arrived in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries. On 23 June the delegation was received at the USSR Supreme Soviet. V.P. Ruben, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, familiarized the guests with the structure and activity of the supreme organ of state power.

The Ugandan delegation had a meeting with activists of the Soviet Solidarity Committee. During their talk P. Masette-Kuuya expressed profound thanks to the Soviet public for their support for the African peoples' just struggle against the imperialist policy of neocolonialism and against racism and apartheid and for the aid rendered by the Soviet Union to Uganda in the consolidation of its national independence. The sides resolutely denounced the escalation of Israel's barbaric aggression against sovereign Lebanon perpetrated with the support of U.S. militarist circles. Full support and solidarity was expressed with the Arab people of Palestine.

TELEVISION AGREEMENT SIGNED WITH ZIMBABWE

LD030106 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Text] An agreement between the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting and the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation was signed in Harare by Popov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and (Tirivati Kangai), director general of the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation. The document provides for the exchange of television films, programs and newsreel material on the political, economic and cultural life of the Soviet Union and Zimbabwe.

LATIN AMERICANS BOYCOTT U.S. NAVAL EXERCISES

LD042138 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Jul 82

[Text] The naval forces of the United States and Colombia have started joint maneuvers in the Caribbean. Chilean warships will be joining them later. All the other states of Latin America have rejected the Pentagon's invitation. As was noted by UPI, citing reliable sources in the U.S. Defense Department, Latin Americans are boycotting the maneuvers in protest against Washington's support for Britain, which used military force in its dispute with Argentina over the Falkland or Malvinas Islands.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ON U.S. SUBVERSION IN NICARAGUA

PM011037 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jun 82 p 3

[TASS report: "CIA Money"]

[Text] Managua, 16 Jun — The U.S. CIA, following the Reagan administration's instructions, does not cease its vile subversive activity against Nicaragua for a minute. The journal SOBERANIA — the organ of the Central American and Caribbean Anti-Imperialist Tribunal — which is published here writes about this.

It is well known, the journal notes, that the CIA is supporting counterrevolutionary gangs who are committing acts of provocation on Nicaragua's borders with Honduras and Costa Rica. At the same time, the U.S. espionage department is also trying by other means to destabilize the Nicaraguan revolution, in particular, by financing reactionary political, business and religious groups.

Thus, for example, last September the Agency for International Development handed over $1 million to E. Dreyfus, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Nicaraguan Private Sector. This money, SOBERANIA points out, was intended "to enable representatives of the private sector to pursue a training course in the United States."

Reactionary "leaders" often make foreign trips financed by the CIA, the journal writes.

In February and March this year, "private businessmen" received a further $500,000 from the Agency for International Development which they shared with representatives of the top church hierarchy. The financing of religious circles is also part of the subversive intrigues of the CIA which uses them to conduct counterrevolutionary propaganda among religious believers, SOBERANIA stresses.

PRAVDA ON ARGENTINE POLITICAL REORGANIZATION

PM291329 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 82 p 5

[TASS report: "New Argentine President"]

[Text] Buenos Aires, 23 Jun — It has been officially announced here that Gen Reynaldo Bignone (rtć) has been appointed as the new Argentine president. He will take up office 1 July.

In a communique Ground Forces Commander Lt Gen C. Nicolaides said that in accordance with a decision by the commanders of all three branches of the armed forces the ground forces are assuming political leadership of the country. In line with this decision the post of president was offered to R. Bignone, who agreed to take it on for a limited transitional period. The aim of this period is to return the country to constitutional rule as quickly as possible, the timetable being agreed with the leaders of the parties. The necessary steps will be taken in the direction of reorganizing the parties.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 2-5 JULY REPORTED

LD050148 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 2-5 July. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

2 July

Haymaking is in full swing in the Central Chernozem Zone. In Tambovskaya Oblast 15,000 tons of vitaminized grass meal has been prepared. This is much more than last year. (1030 GMT)

Machine operators on the Mordovian steppes are first in north Ossetia to start harvesting winter wheat. (1100 GMT)

In Krasnodarskiy Kray winter barley was laid in swaths on over 100,000 hectares. In North Osetia the quality of strong and hard wheat arriving at procurement points is high. (1200 GMT)

3 July

A correspondent reports from Tyumenskaya Oblast that the harvest in oblasts in the far north is still far off. Sowing is just now coming to an end. A new strain of potato is being introduced in the north, which will be tested at a later date, in northern conditions to produce faster, higher yields. Every year the population in Tyumenskaya Oblast increases at the rate of approximately 100,000. This year overall grain production is planned to be brought up to 2 million tons in the oblast, significantly more than was obtained in previous years. (0200 GMT)

A correspondent talks to a chief agronomist at the south Urals institute of land husbandry about new types of grain: A new type of spring wheat was bred at the institute. In wooded-steppe lands, it gives a yield of up to 50 quintals per hectare. The strain is very resistant to disease. A new type of barley, M-1613, an intensive yield type with a potential yield of more than 66 quintals per hectare, has gone for state testing. Apart from its usual use as storage, the type will be used in beermaking and the food industry. A new variety of pea was developed at the institute, called Chalyabinskiy-24, which is distinguished from earlier types produced by its extra high yield of protein per hectare of sown area, and good cooking qualities and taste. It reaches a yield of 35 quintals per hectare. (1500 GMT)

4 July

Yeyskiy Rayon, Kuban, is an initiator of the production of strong varieties of wheat. Responding to the May plenum, Yeyskiy farmers have resolved that this year almost 1/6 of grain sales will be of super-strong varieties. These contain over 32 percent gluten, as opposed to strong varieties which contain 28-32 percent gluten. They have an increased grain unit and an absence of strain impurity; color, smell and myaline are better. The wheat obtained from them will be used to improve meal and bread quality. There is strong emphasis this year on fighting losses. The rayon started mass harvesting of peas and winter barley. It is planned to carry out thrashing of winter crops in 7-9 calendar days. Harvesting of grain crops started in Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast. As last year, the crops are ripening later than usual. Farmers of southern rayons of Khersonskaya Oblast started harvesting winter barley. (1500 GMT)

5 July

Grain harvesting has started in Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast. Harvesting is starting later than usual, as was the case last year. It is planned to complete the harvest in 10-12 working days. (0200 GMT)

Chimkentskaya Oblast has begun selling grain to the state. An average of 27 quintals per hectare are being obtained on irrigated land, despite the drought which made the crop low and difficult harvest. The digging of potatoes has started in southern Turkmenia. (1100 GMT)

The front of harvest work is widening in the south of the European part of the country. As we were told by the RSFSR Ministry of Agriculture, winter wheat has ripened in the east of Stavropolskiy Kray, mass harvesting of barley is underway on the farms of the Kuban, and in some regions wheat is being harvested on a selective basis. In many fields the barley has yielded a fine harvest. Cutting has now been carried out on 250,000 hectares in the kray. Farms in the steppe regions of Kabardino-Balkaria have begun harvesting wheat. Late row crops are developing well in the plantations of the northern Caucasus. The roots of sugar beet are growing intensively here and sunflower and potatoes are doing well. Mass harvesting of barley is now underway in Moldavia, and it has begun in many oblasts of southern Ukraine. (1500 GMT)

EDITORIAL VIEWS IMPORTANCE OF GRAIN PRODUCTION

PM301049 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 82 p 1

[Editorial: "Grain Is Paramount"]

[Text] Our arable farming is carried out in difficult and often extreme conditions. In order to obtain stable yields of agricultural crops — and primarily grain crops — the state invested more and more funds with every 5-year period to create zones of guaranteed harvests. In some cases it is necessary to go to great expense to irrigate the dry steppes, while in other cases, conversely, water must be drained from waterlogged areas, and they must be grubbed out and fertilized.... The power available for our agriculture is steadily increasing and broad programs are being implemented for improving agriculture's efficiency in all sectors of production.

The CPSU Central Committee March (1965) plenum is of special significance in the life of the Soviet countryside. The party set its course at that plenum toward sharply increasing capital investments in agriculture, strengthening its material and technical base and improving planning and economic incentives for production. "The guidelines of the CPSU Central Committee March plenum," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his report "On the USSR Food Program for the Period Through 1990 and Measures for Its Implementation" at the Central Committee May (1982) plenum, "developed by subsequent plenums and by the CPSU 24th-26th Congress, have formed the basis of the party's modern agrarian policy — a scientific and correct policy, from which we have not deviated and will not deviate."

The measures adopted by the party and the selfless labor of kolkhoz members, sovkhoz workers, specialists and workers in industry have produced highly impressive results. "Yet nonetheless, we cannot rest content with what has been achieved," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev stressed, "and we cannot fail to see that the food problem is still a long way from being removed from the agenda."

The party has once more cited the increasing of grain yields as the basis for an intensive increase in food production and the key problem of agriculture. It is planned to obtain annually up to 238-243 million tons of grain on average in the 11th 5-Year Plan and 250-255 million tons in the 21th. In order to reach such a high goal while maintaining the stability of the sowing areas, the yield of grain crops will have to be increased by 6-7 quintals during the decade and reach 21-22 quintals per hectare by 1990.

In their numerous letters and telegrams, Soviet people warmly welcome this line taken by the party.

It is proposed that the Communist Party Central Committees and Councils of Ministers of union republics, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, local party, Soviet and agricultural organs and kolkhozes and sovkhozes carry out necessary measures to increase the grain yields and gross harvests, improve the quality of grain and reduce losses.

There will be a lot of painstaking work here. The structure of the graingrowing areas will have to be reviewed meticulously. Approximately 30 million tons of grain a year need to go directly to the people's dining table. The remaining amount is used for fodder purposes and for processing for other products. At the same time the grain content of mixed feed is excessively high in our country -- a much greater percentage than in other countries. The mixed feed industry deserves to be sternly rebuked for this.

For many years in our country selection has been oriented mainly toward creating food strains of wheat and rye and has not been concerned with fodder strains of these crops, and this is also at variance with world practice. This situation must be remedied without delay. The fact that in the sowing structure of grain and pulse crops excessively small areas have allotted to soybeans and peas, which are rich in protein and are a splendid preceding crop for wheat, arouses serious concern. The quality of food grain has dropped in recent years too.

This is why it is necessary for soviet, and agricultural organs and farm specialists, now that broad initiative is being offered to kolkhozes and sovkhozes, to ponder when drawing up their local programs, how to conduct matters most rationally so that each hectare not simply produces high yields but ensures high weight gains and milk yields in the livestock unit and guarantees the high quality of the numerous products obtained from grain. This must be the firm course geared not to interim succes but toward end results in the production of foodstuffs.

The Food Program sets the task of achieving a steady growth of gross harvests of high-quality grain of the durum and strong varieties of wheat on the sun-drenched expanses of Kazakhstan, the North Caucasus, the Volga Region, the steppe region of the Urals and Siberia and in the southern Ukraine. It is economically advantageous for farms to cultivate these wheats, for considerable extra payments are made for strong and durum varieties.

It is planned to grow winter rye in ever-increasing quantities in the RSFSR Non-Chernozem Zone, the Volga Region, the Polesye area of the Ukraine, in Belorussia and in the Baltic republics. It is planned to increase the yield and gross harvests of millet and buckwheat in RSFSR's Central Chernozem and Non-Chernozem Zones, in the Volga Region, the south Urals, West Siberia, the Ukraine and Kazakhstan.

"Make fuller use of the great potential of corn," it says in the Food Program, "to increase the resources of fodder grain as well as increasing production of barley and oats. Ensure a gross harvest of corn grain of at least 17 million tons in 1985 and 20 million tons in 1990. Carry out measures to further specialize and concentrate corn grain production on kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the Ukrainian SSR, the Moldavian SSR, the North Caucasus, the lower Volga Region, the south of the RSFSR Central Chernozem Zone, the Kazakh SSR, the republics of Central Asia and Transcaucasia. Introduce industrial methods of cultivating and harvesting this crop over its entire sowing area."

Already in the current 5-year plan seed-growing of grain crops will be transferred onto an industrial basis everywhere, which will enable the introduction of new strains and hybrids into widespread practice to be accelerated.

...Grain is paramount. Farmers will be providing more and more of it. It is our wealth and we must treat it as something precious -- thriftily, economically, losing neither grain in the field nor crumbs on the table. And there is now no greater task for local soviets and agricultural organs than to prepare for and carry out the harvest in exemplary fashion on every farm and make a tremendous contribution this very year to implementing the Food Program.

AGRICULTURE MINISTRY VIEWS HARVEST PREPARATIONS

PM021425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 82 p 2

[Agricultural review compiled by USSR Agriculture Ministry specialists: "Preparing for Harvest Work"]

[Excertps] June is haymaking time. The roar of engines can be heard virtually all day and all night in the meadows. Scythes are swinging on land which is not in agricultural use and on which machinery cannot be used.

The USSR statistical administration reports that by 21 June the country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes had laid in 7.1 million tons of hay, 13.8 million tons of haylage and 1.2 million tons of grass meal and had started butting silage. In southern parts winter grain has ripened and vegetables and berries are being harvested.

Most farms in the country are completing preparations for harvest work. Machine operators are carefully tending the crops, especially in areas where industrial techniques have been introduced.

The harvesting and transport complexes are almost made up. Around 170,000 of them will be operating including 62,000 in the grain harvest. The shift method will be widely employed; the crews of combines and trucks will change every few hours. This will permit the use of equipment virtually around the clock.

Party, soviet and economic organs are attaching great important to the servicing of equipment. The harvesting and transport complexes and detachments will include 113,000 special repair groups. They have mobile workshops, spare parts and refueling units. Zonal support bases, carrying the requisite parts and assemblies, are now operating in Moldavia. The spare parts must be as close as possible to the fields. Every harvesting and transport detachment must have a stock of parts.

One of the farmers' priority tasks is to complete equipment repairs. According to USSR Central Statistical Administration data, by mid-June over 90 percent of the mowers and 73 percent of the silage-harvesting combines had been repaired. Some 86 percent of the grain-harvesting units and as many trucks and tractor trailers, 72 percent of the reapers and 75-80 percent of the machines for harvesting sugar beet, flax, potatoes and corn were ready. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Latvia, Stavropolskiy and Altayskiy Krays and Moskovskaya and Bryanskaya Oblasts have nearly finished overhauling grain combines.

But not everywhere is the machinery ready. Many grain combines have yet to be repaired in Novgorodskaya, Kirovskaya, Amurskaya, Permskaya and Kurganskaya Oblasts. Repair work on units for harvesting silage crops and corn is slow in Turkmenia. Beet-top-harvesting machines are not yet ready on a number of beet-sowing farms.

Some of the industrial enterprises are failing to cope with spare parts production targets. Rubber items are arriving late at farms. There are holdups in the production of V-belts and fan belts and other harvesting machinery parts by enterprises of the Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry. The odd gasket may seem trivial to some people, but a combine may be unable to start work for want of such a trifle. For instance, last year spare parts shortages meant that several thousand units could not operate.

The forthcoming harvest campaign will be a severe test for working people in all components of the agroindustrial complex. The farmers must be joined in the struggle for high final results by the organizations which provide services for the countryside. Transport workers have a special responsibility. Around 1.5 million trucks will be operating in the fields. Using every vehicle to the full and avoiding idle periods and empty runs means that harvest losses, which have been considerable in a number of places in the past, will be prevented.

It is important to skillfully direct transport operations. Trucks will have to be transferred from one oblast to another. Thousands of extra vehicles will have to be sent into some regions. The available transport must be efficiently utilized and good working and recreational conditions must be created for the drivers. It is worth looking at the experience of a number of farms in Rostovskaya and Saratovskaya Oblasts which are successfully using the team contract method for harvest shipments.

Procurement workers have nearly finished their preparations. The Food Program talks of the need to bring reception, storage and processing facilities closer to the production area. This work must be embarked on forthwith. Where necessary, small enterprises are to be set up near kolkhozes and sovkhozes or directly on farms, making wide use of lightweight, prefabricated structures. In recent years there has been a mania in some places for the construction of large plants and storage facilities many tens or even hundreds of kilometers from the fields. For example, the sugar refineries of the USSR Ministry of the Food Industry have curtailed the network of beet-reception centers. The size of losses increases and the quality of the product declines in proportion to the distance it has to travel from plantation to enterprises.

The crops are ripening in the fields. We must do all we can to bring them in at the proper time.

FODDER HARVEST STATUS, PROBLEMS EXAMINED

RSFSR Progress

PM051501 Moscow SOVESTKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Jun 82 p 2

["Agricultural Review" prepared by unnamed RSFSR Ministry of Agriculture specialists: "The Green Harvest Is Calling People Out to the Meadows"]

[Excerpt] Favourable conditions have emerged in many areas of the RSFSR for the successful progress of the "green harvest." Day by day the work front is becoming broader in the meadows. According to RSFSR Central Statistical Administration statistics, 4.7 million hectares of grass, 11.8 percent of the plan, had been cut by 21 June. Some 1.9 million tons of hay, 3.7 million tons of cured hay and 2.2 million tons of grass meal had been procured.

Over 40,000 specialized detachments and links whose labor remuneration in many instances is dependent on the quantity and quality of work done -- on the contract principle -- have gone out into the fodder field.

The Food Program has faced the republic's fodder procurers with crucial tasks. To resolve them it is necessary right now to show the utmost organization, to make efficient use of machinery and to strictly monitor the observance of techniques. This is how advanced farms are performing, striving to replenish forage stocks rapidly and to high standards. Rostovskaya Oblast's giant sovkhoz completed the first cut of grass and procured 1,500 tons of hay in a very short time. Many machine operators in the Tatarskaya and Kalmytskaya ASSR's and Voronezhskaya and Belgorodskaya Oblasts are considerably overfulfilling the targets. Comprehensive specialized detachments and harvest and transport links are also working actiively in other areas of the RSFSR.

One feature of the present harvest work is the widespread application of industrial fodder procurement methods. Vitamin meal, granule and pellet production units are in operation everywhere. About 100 tons of grass meal have already been produced by each drying mechanism in Krasnodarskiy and Stavropolskiy Krays.

However, not all farms are following the example set by pacemakers. In a number of places the optimum time for haymaking is being missed. Novgorodskaya, Pskovskaya, Ivanovskaya and Kalininskaya Oblasts are still working slowly.

Less than 3 percent of the area has been gathered there whereas Moskovskaya, Bryanskaya and Vladimirskaya Oblasts have done nearly four times more. The farms of Permskaya, Sverdlovskaya, Kurskaya and Tambovskaya Oblasts are not making full use of their potential for procuring hay and other fodder.

Some farm leaders justify the slow pace of the green harvest by reference to the bad weather. For example, the Penzenskaya Oblast movers hesitated in the wet weather. However, it is just necessary to ventilate the grass more actively and stack the cured hay and silage at the same time. Many kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Smolenskaya, Tulskaya, Voronezhskaya and some other oblasts did not back down in the face of bad weather: They stacked the green matter in trenches and packed it well, filling the storage facilities in no more than 5 days.

Reclaimed lands are acquiring an important role in fodder production. At present 3.1 million hectares of irrigated lands in the republic are given over to forage crops, hay and pasturage. Ensuring the high productivity of these lands is a very important task. Equal demands are being made on the use of unirrigated lands, too. About 600,000 hectares of them are to be irrigated this year. The arable farmers of Orenburgskaya Oblast, Tatarskaya ASSR and Altayskiy Kray are striving to irrigate as large an area as possible.

Special attention should be paid to natural hayfields. They are a very important source of very cheap fodder.

Alarm signals are continuing to come in from some farms: The prompt assessment of fodder quality has not been organized and the payment of teams, detachments and links has still not been made directly dependent on end results. These errors must be rectified quickly and all the express laboratories for assessing procured grass quality and Rosselkhozkhimiya chemicalization stations must be involved in the work everywhere.

Organization Problems

PM051217 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 23 Jun 82 p 1

[Report by SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent S. Luzgan: "No Haymaking Delays Allowed"]

[Text] Ukrainian SSR -- It is time for mass haymaking in the Ukraine. It is a busy time: The grass has to be cut quickly in order to get a good second and, moreover, third growth. There is a lot of work to do. This year there are 6.4 million hectares of sown and natural grasses in the republic. And there are the people and the equipment to bring it in. The republic's farms have set up 13,000 specialized subunits; and these comprise experienced workers who have been given the necessary equipment.

Fodder procurement workers in Krymskaya and Kharkovskaya Oblasts are setting an example of shock labor. The fodder field structure has been improved in those areas and the areas sown to pulse crops and pulse and cereal mixtures have been expanded. More irrigated land is under fodder crops.

In practically every oblast there are farms and rayons which have organized haymaking well and which are striving to harvest the grass at the right time, when their nutritional content is at its highest: cereals -- during ear formation, pulses -- in the budding phase. The example of the Dnipro Kolkhoz in Cherkasskaya Oblast is instructive. Livestock units there always have plenty of forage. Every fodder hectare provides as much as 100 quintals of fodder units. "Above all," says kolkhoz chairman I. Klimenko, communicating his experience, "we try to complete the first cut as early as possible. We never delay the grass harvest. For that reason we get three cuts. This year we started the first cut on 25 May and finished quickly."

As a result of the priority development of fodder production, the farm is increasing livestock unit output according to plan and it keeps 86 head of cattle, including 35 cows, per 100 hectares of land. This year milk production will reach 1,400 quintals per 100 hectares.

Unfortunately, not everywhere is the situation as good as that. Many farms in the Ukraine are still waiting for the grass to grow enough. The haymaking rate is lower than last year. Less than 1/2 of the grass has been cut once and less hay, haylage, silage matter and dehydrated fodder has been procured. Fodder procurement has not yet found the required tempo on farms in Chernigovskaya, Zhitomirskaya, Kiyevskaya and Rovenskaya Oblasts. In those places only 12-27 percent of the planned area of grass has been cut. Grass meal preparation units are being underutilized on most farms in Vinnitskaya, Volynskaya and Ternopolskaya Oblasts.

Not all the fodder-harvesting equipment is operating. And the equipment that is operating is being underutilized: The grass meal units are more often than not operating on a single shift basis and they are often out of action because of breakdowns or late arrival of raw material. Whereas in Kharkovskaya Oblast 87 tons of artificially dehydrated fodder has already been manufactured per unit, the figures for Vinnitskaya, Zakarpatskaya, Volynskaya and Cherkasskaya Oblasts range from 12 to 24 tons.

The wintering period demonstratedagain how important it is to lay in plenty of coarse and succulent fodder. Farms which had procured a ton and more of hay per cow did not suffer a loss of livestock productivity even if there was a shortage of concentrates. But procurement of this valuable fodder is slow this year. Of the planned 6.3 million tons of hay only around 800,000 tons have been laid in.

If you want a strict appraisal of the fodder procurement situation, then it has to be plainly stated that these shortcomings are due primarily to unsatisfactory organization of very important operations. As in the past, many oblasts have announced "shock fodder procurement months." For example, the Vinnitksiy Ukrainian CP Obkom and the oblispolkom adopted a resolution on holding one. It was to run from 10 June through 10 July. The resolution is crammed with general appeals and instructions: "Provide assistance," "exercise control," "organize highly productive use of equipment." But in the farms and rayons which basically decide the fate of fodder procurements there is a patent lack of organizational work among those who bear the full responsibility for this, who are in charge of fodder production sections in kolkhozes, sovkhozes and interfarm enterprises and who are working actually in the meadows and fields.

The other day, the leaders of three ministries — agriculture, sovkhozes, land reclamation and water resources -- held a conference with oblast subunit workers. The conference discussed the unsatisfactory utilization of reclaimed land, asking, in particular, why the irrigation of fodder crops is slow and disorganized. One would have welcomed this joint discussion of an important issue were it not for the fact that it bore the imprint of formalism. Yields are still low on reclaimed land, especially in such oblasts as Voroshilovgradskaya, Nikolayevskaya and Dnepropetrovskaya. Crop irrigation was late there, irrigation procedures are being grossly violated and sprinklers are being misused. But it is not the first time and not the first year these shortcomings have been mentioned.

Before the conference executives from the ministries went out into the countryside, however, they went not in order to eliminate shortcomings but to gather more facts for the ministers' future speeches. What is this if not formalism?

CSA REPORTS HAYMAKING PRODUCTIVITY INCREASES

LD032050 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 3 Jul 82

[Text] Haymaking is underway in all republics. According to the USSR Central Statistical Administration, by the start of July, sown and natural grasses had been reaped over more than 23 million hectares. Some 11 million tons of hay and more than 12 million tons of haylage have been laid in. Some 60,000 mechanized teams are now engaged in haymaking in the country's farms, many of them on a basis of financial autonomy under the self-planning system. Earnings are decided by the end result. The application of this innovation in the Ukraine, for instance, has led to a considerable increase in labor productivity, which in many instances has doubled.

SALYUT-7 STATION CONTINUES RESEARCH MISSION

LD060914 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 6 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS -- TASS special correspondent reports from the flight control centre:

Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev are in orbit for the 55th day.

During the past few days, upon the completion of the program of joint experiments by the Soviet-French crew, the cosmonauts took rest, checked up the onboard systems and equipment of the Salyut-7 station and prepared it for subsequent operation. On July 3 the trajectory of the orbital complex was corrected with the station's engines.

The schedule for today lays emphasis on geophysical research for science and for different sectors of the national economy. The cosmonauts carry out visual observations and photography of individual areas of the earth surface and parts of the world's oceans, using spectrometry and radiometry equipment and stationary photo cameras.

Biological experiments to study possibilities for growing higher plants in outer space continue aboard the complex. The crew maintain proper conditions in equipment with plants and record characteristics of their development.

According to telemetry data, the flight of the research complex Salyut-7 -- Soyuz T-5 proceeds normally. The parameters of the orbit at present are as follows: maximum distance from the earth surface -- 344 km; minimum distance from the earth surface -- 309 km; period of revolution -- 90.8 minutes; inclination -- 51.6 degrees.

Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev are in good health and feel well.

EARTH TREMOR REGISTERED IN DUSHANBE ON 2 JULY

LD021546 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1145 GMT 2 Jul 82

[Text] Dushanbe, 2 Jul (TASS) -- At 1104 Moscow time today underground tremors were felt on the territory of Tadzhikistan (Central Asia). According to reports from the Dushanbe seismic station, the epicenter of the earthquake was in the mountains on the territory of Afghanistan, about 300 kilometers from the Tadzhik capital. In the towns of Dushanbe, Khorog and Kulyab the strength of the underground tremors reached force four. The earthquake did not cause any destruction.